Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-081
Thursday
26 April 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-081 *26 April 1990*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Karpov Speaks at 'Open Skies' News Conference *[Budapest Radio]* 1
No Signing in Budapest *[Budapest Radio]* 1
'Difficulties Still Exist' *[TASS]* 1

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Impact of 'Radical Changes' on CEMA Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Apr]* 2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Lithuania Used To Divert Attention From Germany *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Apr]* 4
Roundup of World Media Comment on Lithuania *[PRAVDA 24 Apr]* 4
Shevardnadze Addresses Foreign Ministry on Policy *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 16]* 5
Deputy Foreign Minister Discusses Military Costs *[TASS]* 11
Forum on European Economic Cooperation Viewed *[PRAVDA 24 Apr]* 12
'New Atlanticism' Causes Disagreement in NATO *[PRAVDA 24 Apr]* 13
U.S. Case for Shunning UNESCO 'Unconvincing' *[IZVESTIYA 24 Apr]* 13
Intensified Japan-U.S. Exercises Assessed *[Kalinin on Moscow International]* 14

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Solton Terms Bush 'Wise Politician' on Lithuania *[Moscow International]* 15
Bush, Fitzwater on Lithuania, U.S.-USSR Ties *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 26 Apr]* 15
U.S. Media Cited on Bush's Lithuania Policy *[IZVESTIYA 26 Apr]* 16
Bessmertnykh Receives U.S. Ambassador Matlock *[TASS]* 17
U.S. House Resolution on Jerusalem Condemned *[TASS]* 17
U.S. Report on USSR Military Spending Cited *[IZVESTIYA 22 Apr]* 17
RSFSR Leader Meets Former U.S. Official *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Apr]* 18
U.S., USSR Stances on Asian Force Cuts Eyed *[IZVESTIYA 23 Apr]* 18
Commentator Calls Marti 'Electronic Warfare' *[Moscow International]* 19
TASS Reports Alaskan Radar Modernization 20

China

Li Peng Ends Moscow Visit, Leaves for Leningrad 20
More on Gorbachev, Li Peng Meeting *[Moscow International]* 20
Li Peng Speaks at Friendship House *[Moscow International]* 20
Shevardnadze, Li Peng Meet *[Moscow TV]* 22
Shevardnadze, Qian Qichen Talk *[TASS]* 22
Li Peng Holds News Conference *[TASS]* 23
Li Peng Visits Star City *[Moscow TV]* 23
Ryzhkov Joins Li Peng at Theater *[Moscow TV]* 24
Li Peng Gives Speech on Moscow TV *[Moscow TV]* 24
Three-Day Moscow Visit Reviewed *[TASS]* 25
Li Peng Leaves for Leningrad *[Moscow Radio]* 25

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev Receives Ambassadors' Credentials *[TASS]* 26
Soviet Chamber Head in Seoul Interviewed *[Moscow International]* 26
U.S. Peninsula Presence Adds to DPRK 'Fears' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Apr]* 27

Vegetables, Fruit Exported to Soviet Union *[Moscow International]* 27
Japanese Defense Plans Arouse Regional Anxiety *[TASS]* 28

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Rogachev Views USSR-Pacific Rim Relations *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 20 Apr]* 28
Thai Deputy Premier's USSR Visit Reported *[Moscow International]* 30
Rogachev Meets New Zealand National Party Head *[TASS]* 31
Nishanov Receives Bolger *[IZVESTIYA 22 Apr]* 31
Seminar on Perestroyka, Southeast Asia Held *[TASS]* 31

Near East & South Asia

Afghan General Appraises Assistance From USSR *[TASS]* 31
Restrictions Lifted on Soviets Hajj Participants *[Tehran IRNA]* 31
Soviet Jews Debate Issues With PLO Envoys *[IZVESTIYA 24 Apr]* 32
Egyptian Proposal for Weapons Pact Noted *[PRAVDA 20 Apr]* 34
Commentary Says Iran Behind Lebanon Terrorists *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 34
Ambassador to Oman Reassigned to Iraq *[IZVESTIYA 23 Apr]* 35

East Europe

Sajudis Agency Notes Solidarity Backs Lithuania *[Vilnius Radio]* 35
TRUD Reports Solidarity Congress Opening *[19 Apr]* 35
Bucharest Demonstration Against Iliescu Reported *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Apr]* 35
Hungarian 'Insinuations' on Troop Pullout Rebutted *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Apr]* 36
New Payment System in Trade With Bulgaria Noted *[TASS]* 37
Civic Forum Blamed for 'Attacks' on CPCZ *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Apr]* 37
Possible Effects of Pope's CSFR Visit Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 25 Apr]* 37

West Europe

Gorbachev Sends Message to FRG's Lafontaine *[TASS]* 38
FRG's Kohl Cited on Interference in Lithuania *[TASS]* 38
Gremitskikh on Two-Plus-Four Talks, German Unity *[East Berlin HORIZONT No 5/90]* 38
USSR Wants Troop Treaty With United Germany *[East Berlin NEUE ZEIT 18 Apr]* 39
Lukyanov Meets With Irish Parliamentarians *[TASS]* 39
Interior Minister Bakatin Arrives in Cyprus *[TASS]* 40
EEC Foreign Ministers on Europe, Lithuania *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Apr]* 40

Latin America & Caribbean

Delegation Leaves for Nicaraguan Inauguration *[IZVESTIYA 25 Apr]* 41
TASS Reports Nicaraguan Government Formation 41
'Definitive' Cease-Fire Reached With Contras *[IZVESTIYA 21 Apr]* 41

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Moscow TV Carries 25 April Supreme Soviet Session 43
Combatting of Chernobyl Effects Debated 43
Doguzhiyev Continues Report 43
Deputies Cite Facts, Figures 44
Seriousness of Accident Noted 45
Deputies Question Late Action 45
Deputies Note Affected Areas 46
Velikhov Notes Scientific Work 47
Doguzhiyev Answers Questions 48
Chernobyl Resolution Approved 49
Resolution on Chernobyl Passed 25 April *[TASS]* 49
Gomel Deputy Considers Aftermath Program *[Moscow Radio]* 50

Doguzhiyev Gives Report on Chernobyl *[Moscow TV]* 50
Velikhov Remarks on Chernobyl *[Moscow Radio]* 53
Ryzhkov Answers Correspondents on Chernobyl *[Moscow Radio]* 54
Religious Subcommittee Meets on Bill *[TASS]* 55
Constitutional Compliance Committee To Be Elected *[TASS]* 55

Political & Social

Issues 'Skirted' by Central Committe Platform *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Apr]* 55
Roundtable Comments on Gdlyan Affair *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 15]* 56
Confusion Reigns at Komsomol Congress Over Appeal
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 17 Apr] 59
Attacks on Lenin Show Anger Toward His Heirs *[PRAVDA 22 Apr]* 60
New Health Minister Lists Sector's Priorities *[IZVESTIYA 24 Apr]* 62
Glasnost in KGB Viewed, Compared to France *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 16]* 63
Andreyeva Interviewed on Perestroyka *[Budapest Radio]* 64
Poverty Seen as Means of State Control *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 19 Apr]* 66
Planned Contracts for Internal Troops Explained *[IZVESTIYA 6 Apr]* 70
Journalists Give Emoluments to Chernobyl Fund *[PRAVDA 19 Apr]* 70
Contents of Latest Issue of KOMMUNIST Reported *[PRAVDA 19 Apr]* 70

Economics

Gorbachev Aide Ponders Economic Reform *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 24 Apr]* 71

Agricultural

Agricultural Developments for 19-24 Apr *[Moscow Radio]* 76

Scientific

Space Cooperation Pact Signed With W. Europe *[TASS]* 77
Correction to Interview on Space Initiatives 77

Military

Northern Fleet's Bases Checked for Radioactivity *[TASS]* 77
Akhromeyev Answers Soldiers' Phone Questions *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Apr]* 78

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Vilnius Radio Carries 25 Apr Council Session 84
Agenda Presented 84
Antiblockade Law Debated 84
Antiblockade Law Adopted 85
Prunskiene Addresses 25 Apr Council Session *[Vilnius Radio]* 85
Deputy Makes Statement on Anticommunist Leaflets *[Vilnius Radio]* 86
Brazauskas Gives Report on Fuel, Railway Blockade *[Vilnius Radio]* 87
Lithuanian Supreme Council Agenda Published *[Vilnius Radio]* 88
Moscow Radio Reports on Economic Blockade 88
Stoppages Due to Fuel Shortage Reported *[IZVESTIYA 26 Apr]* 89
Timber, Paper Shortage *[Vilnius Radio]* 89
Health Service Affected *[Vilnius Radio]* 90
Lithuania Blockade Creates Latvia Shortages *[Vilnius International]* 90
Shortages in Lithuania Will Affect USSR *[Vilnius International]* 90
Power Strengthened To React to Economic Blockade *[Vilnius Radio]* 90
Military Paper Disputes Results of Blockade *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Apr]* 91
Lithuanian Economic Situation Said Worsening *[TASS]* 91

Lithuanian Commission Views Economic Situation *[Vilnius Radio]* 91
Presidential Council Member on Lithuanian Events *[TASS]* 92
Lithuania Economic Crimes on Increase *[Vilnius International]* 93
Legal Aspects of Lithuania Situation Viewed *[TASS]* 93
Journalist Interviewed on Lithuanian Coverage *[EKHO LITVY 12 Apr]* 93
Deputies Unable To Reach Soviet Officials *[Vilnius International]* 94
Ryzhkov Interviewed on Lithuania, Economy *[Moscow International]* 94
Appeal From Informal Groups Supports Lithuania *[EKHO LITVY 31 Mar]* 95
Trade Union Protests Policy on Working Days *[Tallinn Radio]* 96
Landsbergis, Others Speak at Vilnius Rally *[EKHO LITVY 10 Apr]* 96
Landsbergis Asks Gorbachev for Restraint *[EKHO LITVY 11 Apr]* 97
Prunskiene Letter to Gorbachev, Ryzhkov *[EKHO LITVY 12 Apr]* 98
Lithuanian Supreme Council Presidium Chosen *[EKHO LITVY 31 Mar]* 98
Report on 25 Apr Estonian Supreme Soviet Session *[Tallinn Radio]* 98
Estonian Parliament Condemns Lithuanian Sanctions *[TASS]* 98
Estonia To Continue Supplying Lithuania *[Vilnius Radio]* 99
Ryuytel, Lippmaa To Meet Yakovlev for Discussions *[Tallinn Radio]* 99
Military Conference Sends Message to Gorbachev *[TASS]* 99

RSFSR

Gorbachev Begins Second Day in Sverdlovsk *[TASS]* 99
Visits Department Store *[Moscow Radio]* 99
Visits Urals Research Center *[TASS]* 100
Reportage on Gorbachev Visit to Uralmash Factories 100
Meets Workers *[TASS]* 100
Talks With Workers *[Moscow Radio]* 100
Addresses Crowd *[Moscow TV]* 102
Further Report on Visit *[TASS]* 103
Visit Reviewed *[Moscow Radio]* 104
Gorbachev in Sverdlovsk Notes Economic Reform *[TASS]* 105
Moscow TV Reports on Gorbachev Sverdlovsk Visit *[Moscow TV]* 105
Journalist Gives Impressions of Uralmash Visit *[Moscow Radio]* 106
TASS Examines Gorbachev's Ural 'Consultations' 106
Yeltsin Assesses RSFSR Congress, Presidency *[Moscow Radio]* 107

Western Republics

Ukrainian Nationalist Discusses Independence *[Rome LA REPUBBLICA 24 Apr]* 108
Ukranian Rukh Leader Argues for Sovereignty *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 15]* 109
Ivashko Concluding Remarks at Party Plenum *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 28 Feb]* 111
Ukrainian Plenum Sociopolitical Decision Reported *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 24 Feb]* 112
Moldavian Party First Secretary Interviewed *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 16]* 114

Caucasus

Weapons Seized in Attack on Military Detail *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Apr]* 116
Situation on Iran-Azerbaijan Border Reported *[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 6 Mar]* 116
Soldier Wounded in Attack on Azerbaijani Town *[Baku Radio]* 118
Ordzhonikidze Rayon Name Changed to Surakhanskiy *[KOMMUNIST 19 Apr]* 118
Azerbaijan Interior Minister Appointed *[Baku KOMMUNIST 19 Apr]* 119
Georgia Party Calls for Aid to Lithuania *[Vilnius Radio]* 119
More on Georgian Support *[Vilnius Radio]* 119
Georgian Church Head Appeals to Gorbachev *[Moscow Radio]* 119

Central Asia

Radiation Sources Discovered in Tashkent, Samarkand *[Moscow TV]* 119
Tajik Supreme Soviet Chairman Notes Tasks *[Moscow Radio]* 119
Dushanbe Curfew Extended *[TASS]* 120
Supreme Soviet Makes Appointments *[KOMMUNIST TAJIKISTANA 14 Apr]* 120

Karpov Speaks at 'Open Skies' News Conference

LD2504110490 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1000 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Excerpts] From the point of view of East-West relations, the way in which the Budapest round of the "Open Skies" conference ends is far from indifferent. Istvan Kulcsar reports:

[Kulcsar] [passage omitted] Viktor Karpov, deputy minister of foreign affairs and head of the Soviet delegation said at a press conference that the second phase of the conference in Budapest began in a matter-of-fact atmosphere, and that this offers good hope for the sides arrving at a common denominator over remaining issues.

In the present phase, in Karpov's view, it is possible to clarify the technical issues, but deciding the questions of principle may possibly await the foreign ministers.

He announced that it would hardly be possible to sign an "Open Skies" agreement by 12 May, and what is more, this deadline was not realistic to begin with.

The Soviet deputy foreign minister listed in great detail the multitude of technical issues awaiting solution, although he emphasized that it was not primarily the differences of views which exist in this respect which have been obstructing agreement.

The press conference is continuing: Within the new few minutes, Ambassador Hayes, head of the U.S. delegation, will begin briefing the press.

No Signing in Budapest

LD2504210890 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1600 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] The "Open Skies" agreement, which in the long-term could strengthen confidence between the opposing military forces, will not be signed in Budapest after all. As it is known, experts have been consulting in Budapest for the third day on the conditions under which the individual countries could contribute to surveillance overflights by foreign, unarmed military aircraft. Istvan Kulcsar reports:

[Kulscar] The "Open Skies" agreement will come about in all certainty this year. However, we can probably bury the plan for a signing in Budapest on 12 May and for a meeting of foreign ministers from 23 powers to be held on this occasion, which was made so much of by the foreign ministry of the organizing country. This became definitely clear to representatives of the Hungarian and international press, who heard successively today news conferences held by the heads of the delegations of the two superpowers, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Karpov and U.S. Ambassador Howes.

Viktor Karpov began in an optimistic tone: He said that the atmosphere of the conference was objective. Then I asked him the following question: There originally were very great hopes among the delegations that the conference would conclude by 12 May. Now, however, we hear opinions to the effect that this will scarcely happen, and here, alongside the technical issues of detail, there is mention of an obstacle of principle that the Soviet Union's principled stand in the issue of disarmament has become more rigid in Vienna and here.

In his reply, the Soviet deputy foreign minister said that in their view, the 12 May date for signing was unrealistic from the outset. The participants still had too many technical issues to clarify. What is more, there seemed to be disputed issues which apparently were technical, but in fact were political, and a meeting of the foreign ministers will probably be necessary to solve these.

Karpov said it was probably that the disputed issues of "Open Skies" will be discussed at the May meeting of the Soviet and U.S. foreign ministers, and then presidents. He acknowledged that the international disarmament discussions, primarily the Vienna talks on the reduction of conventional armed forces, have slowed down. He, however, explained this by referring not to a rigidification of the Soviet position, but to the wait-and-see tactics of certain Western powers—they are observing the East German and East European developments, in order to be able to make use of these in accordance with their own interests.

John Howes, head of the U.S. delegation, at the point of departure, agreed with his Soviet counterpart. The U.S. ambassador also voiced his opinion that there will not be a meeting in Budapest of foreign ministers from 23 powers on 12 May, on the occasion of signing an "Open Skies" agreement, because it will not be ready by then. However, he said there is a good chance that this important confidence-building agreement will be finalized this year.

'Difficulties Still Exist'

LD2604012990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1633 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] Budapest, 25 April (TASS)—The international conference on "Open Skies" is continuing its work in the Hungarian capital. The 23 Warsaw Pact and NATO member countries are participating in its work. V.P. Karpov, a USSR deputy foreign minister, who addressed a press conference held here, noted that there are positive changes in the U.S. position on a number of the topics under discussion. The Soviet side has also compromised on several important issues. But difficulties still exist. They are connected primarily with the procedure for exchanging information on verification flights.

The Soviet side advocates the most effective possible use of the Budapest stage of the conference to solve this and other technical issues contained in the agenda. A good foundation was laid in Ottawa for reaching an agreement. If we manage to erect one more story of this building, a decisive step will have been taken on the way to the signing of an international treaty on "Open Skies", he stated.

The conference is continuing its work.

Impact of 'Radical Changes' on CEMA Viewed

90UF0092A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Apr 90 First Edition p 3

[Article by Candidate of Economic Sciences P. Shinkarenko: "CEMA: Renewal Rather Than Capitulation"]

[Text] A wave of radical transformations sweeping the countries of East Europe has washed away a good deal of obsolete organizational structures. In conjunction with this, there is much talk about the future of their first international organization—the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. Diametrically opposed predictions are frequently made on this account. Recently the French LIBERACION observed: "The East European countries which have opted for a market economy reject CEMA, which is becoming increasingly unnecessary." What is the basis for such predictions?

Under a Single Plan

The Council for Mutual Economic Assistance has existed for 41 years now. This is a unique organization which has united the economies of East European countries ravaged by war on the principles of equality and justice and has played an important role in the socioeconomic development of its member countries.

Ten countries belonging to CEMA account for approximately one-third of the industrial production of the world and one-forth of the national income generated in the world. It is significant that in years past the turnover of mutual trade of the member countries of the council has grown by a factor of 40.

If we were to examine the rates of economic growth in individual allied states, one more achievement of CEMA would become apparent: The economically less developed countries have advanced at a relatively faster rate.

Along with the development of their national economies, the CEMA countries gradually established foreign economic contacts. Subsequently between 70 and 90 percent of the needs of these countries for metal-cutting machine tools, instruments, and computer equipment began to be met on the basis of the existing division of labor and mutual deliveries. Major industrial facilities and a transportation network which connects the CEMA countries have been created through a joint effort.

By the Standards of the Future

Undoubtedly all of this is an accomplishment of both the states belonging to CEMA and the organization itself. However, something else cannot be overlooked either: Initially cooperation was not aimed at close integration in production. Joint efforts were mainly focused on meeting national needs for specific products. This was accomplished mostly by way of coordinating plans and subsequent counter deliveries rather than by way of using national resources and the advantages of the international division of labor efficiently. The system of settlements in transferable rubles which was initially conceived as a multilateral one actually split into clearing arrangements balanced on a bilateral basis.

The drawbacks of this approach became clearly visible in the course of transition to the complex forms of interaction, in particular, to cooperation in production. Attempts to breathe life into CEMA by means of party resolutions and perfecting the instruments of planned operation did not produce results; nor could such results be expected. There was no interest in working in a new manner, particularly on the part of enterprises. As a result, the quality of exported products deteriorated, and there was slippage in the timeliness of deliveries and the responsibility of producers for the future of joint projects.

On the other hand, messages coming from the world market were hardly taken into account. Even the sharp increase of oil prices in the mid-1970's was smoothed by the pricing mechanism which provided for setting moving-average prices in CEMA on the basis of those for the previous five years. Due to this metamorphosis, the oil shock which shook the world economy did not provide the necessary impulse for introducing energy-efficient technologies and saving raw and other materials.

It is hardly surprising that major joint projects (long-range target programs for cooperation in the field of the power industry, machine building, consumer goods, the Comprehensive Program of Scientific-Technical Progress of CEMA Member Countries Until 2000, and others) largely remained mere agreements on intentions. After all, when the documents were prepared it was presupposed that the necessary resources will be forthcoming—it is no secret that they were to come from the Soviet Union.

However, even our country was not necessarily successful in solving the resource problem. This notwithstanding, the USSR in its mutual settlements with, for example, its Bulgarian partners in the last four years lost about R2.5 billion in this area alone. The People's Republic of Bulgaria receives 11.5 million tons of oil and 6.8 billion cubic meters of natural gas annually. However, the USSR does not intend to reduce these deliveries. Moreover, they are going to increase this year by 100,000 tons of oil and refinery products, and 500 million cubic meters of gas.

Accounting Is No Impediment to Friendship

The drawbacks of the old command-and-distribution mechanism became particularly apparent in the environment of an economic reform calling for the expansion of the market, development of economic accountability and economic initiative, and the right of enterprises to seek partners abroad. The mode of further cooperation had to be chosen. As I see it, this requires an entire set of forms and methods which provide for the flexible interaction of national economies and their openness to the world market. While not giving up interstate cooperation

which maps out a strategy of foreign contacts, business ties between enterprises, groups, and associations should still be made a priority.

The Soviet delegation proposed a key to solving the existing problems at the 45th meeting of the CEMA session held in Sofia in January 1990. The concept is based on switching to freely convertible currencies in mutual settlements and to world-market prices in mutual trade effective 1991. It was mentioned on this occasion that the USSR and Poland have already agreed to switch over approximately 10 to 15 of their mutual turnover of goods to the new system of settlements on an experimental basis as early as this year.

This radical proposal designed to form a united market in the future got a mixed reception in the CEMA countries. Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia came out in favor of it, and Romania, Bulgaria, and the GDR agreed with them to a degree. However, the attitude of Cuba, Mongolia, and Vietnam was reserved. In the process, even the proponents of switching to the new forms of settlements doubted the expediency of such an acceleration. They said that three to five years will be required for such a step. Expressing the point of view of its country, the Czechoslovak newspaper LIDOVE NOVINY wrote: "This proposal, logical at first sight, is absolutely unacceptable in this form to the small European countries belonging to CEMA." This is how the newspaper explains its caution. The Soviet Union is a virtually monopolistic supplier of oil and natural gas to these countries. Given these large volumes of deliveries (16.6 million tons of oil in 1990), switching to settlements in dollars will become for Czechoslovakia a shock of approximately the same magnitude which it experienced in 1973 and 1974 when oil prices soared.

The CEMA countries have not yet mastered the instruments and methods of calculations which indicate how much a particular national economy contributes and how much it receives in the process of cooperation. Such calculations are an indispensable condition for a purposeful division of labor.

New Chapter in "an Open Book"

Thus, new times have come to the Moscow CEMA building which resembles an open book. However, the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance survives, and this is the main point.

To be sure, serious experts did not have expectations to the contrary. At the height of the discussion, a scientist from the FRG, J. Noetzold, observed: "At a time when the need for economic integration is acknowledged throughout the world, it would be at the very least antihistoric for the process in East Europe to develop in the opposite direction." Hungarian economist J. Hamori noted, ridiculing the predicted "disintegration of CEMA": If the council ceased to exist, the economy of the Republic of Hungary "would simply collapse."

There is no end of work in store for us. Ideological dogmas which dominated CEMA more than 40 years ago are becoming a thing of the past and are being replaced with the real economic interests of individual countries, industries, and mainly those of direct producers—enterprises and companies. In its new role, CEMA appears as the holder and administrator of large-scale scientific-production and technology projects which are strategically significant for the successful development of the interested states.

Undoubtedly the structure of the council itself will also undergo changes. Suggestions have even been made to change its name; to insert "interaction" instead of "mutual assistance" which supposedly reflects the mission of the international organization better. A set of proposals aimed at expanding the rights, specifying the functions, and improving the efficiency of the council, as well as perfecting its statute, will be prepared very soon, as early as the middle of this year. It is expected that these documents will be discussed at the next meeting of the CEMA session.

Lithuania Used To Divert Attention From Germany

PM2504190990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Apr 90 First Edition p 3

[Manki Ponomarev "Commentator's Column": "Card in a Game"]

[Text] For 6 weeks now Lithuania has been the central theme in the world's press. Newspaper front pages have been awash with reports on events in and around Lithuania and the international news sections of radio and television broadcasts open with commentaries on this score. Judging by the reports from the world's news agencies, the Lithuanian question has also the main one at bilateral and multilateral meetings of leaders of the top Western countries held recently.

As is usual in campaigns of this sort, passions are rising all the time. Demands that "in the light of Soviet actions" the most severe measures be taken—even to the point of calling off the summit—are being voiced increasingly loudly, especially in the United States, and the administration's "indecisiveness" is coming in for sharp criticism. Those who generally adhere to sensible positions and who see the cause of the events not in "Moscow's intrigues" but in the hasty, ill-considered, and unconstitutional actions of the Vilnius leadership, are becoming involved willingly or not in this propaganda uproar.

Undoubtedly, many acute present-day problems are bound up in the Lithuanian knot and the attention paid to them is understandable. But those problems are first and foremost a domestic matter for the Soviet Union and it is for the Soviet Union to unravel them. And Moscow has already given enough evidence to show that it is resolving them by political means.

Nevertheless, the fuss in the foreign mass media goes on. You get the impression that some people need this fuss very much and are deliberately fueling the atmosphere of hysteria.

The grounds for this conclusion are obvious. After all, it is undeniable that regardless of this mass media hype or even despite it, the U.S. Administration and the leaders of other Western countries are quite restrained in their behavior and are trying to avoid fueling unnecessary tension. G. Bush, for example, made it plain that in his opinion Lithuania is not worth risking the whole range of relations with the USSR.

Nevertheless, the "Lithuanian card" continues to be actively played. It is very popular with those who think in old terms and would like to profit from the difficulties which the Soviet Union is now facing in the political and economic spheres, interethnic relations, and the international sphere. But that is not the only question, nor is it the most important one. If you discard the verbiage surrounding this card game, it immediately becomes obvious that they are using it to try to divert public attention from one of the most serious problems of the present day. Namely, the unification of Germany and the terms on which that unification is to be realized. In other words, the place of the future Germany in Europe and the security of this continent's peoples.

While the world is in uproar over Lithuania, the leaders of the top Western states agreed among themselves at meetings recently that despite Soviet objections a unified Germany must undoubtedly belong to NATO. They reached agreement even before the external conditions of unification have been discussed at the "two plus four" talks (which are not due to begin until 5 May). It has become known the British and U.S. representatives have absolutely no intention of discussing the problem of German inclusion in NATO with the Soviet Union at all. In the opinion of Britain's INDEPENDENT newspaper, the aim of this scheme is to prevent the USSR from using its veto in the discussion on Germany's future, to isolate the Soviet Union, and to eliminate it from the solution of a question of vital importance both for our country and for European security as a whole.

In the light of what has been said it is clear why the "Lithuanian card" is being played so zealously and why a most real "war of nerves" is being waged around Lithuania. To be honest, if Lithuania didn't exist, those who are harboring plans about Germany's future would have had to invent it. Or to have devised something else to disguise their schemes.

Roundup of World Media Comment on Lithuania

PM2404105690 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Apr 90 Second Edition p 6

[PRAVDA, TASS roundup: "Sober Assessments: The World Press on Lithuania"]

[Text] Tokyo—In the last month Japanese journalists have tried persistently to convince the public here of the alleged lawfulness of the Lithuanian separatists' actions and at the same time cast aspersions on the Soviet leadership's position. However, in recent days political commentators here have increasingly frequently been forced to make critical assessments of the conduct of the Sajudis leaders.

Thus Sumikawa, Moscow correspondent of the newspaper ASAHI, writes in his report that the Vilnius leadership's attempts to depict Lithuania as an autonomous state "are not very convincing, since they ignore the real course of events in the last half-century." A view similar to this assessment is expressed in an editorial in MAINICHI: "The confusion that has gripped Lithuanians since the announcement of the present economic sanctions indicates that the prerequisites do not yet exist in Lithuania for its immediate transformation into an independent state."

Criticizing the present Lithuanian leadership for excessive haste in taking the decision to secede from the Soviet Union, YOMIURI notes in an editorial that the complications in the international atmosphere caused by

the conflict situation in Lithuania "could reduce the potential for Lithuania's transformation into an independent country."

London—Commenting on K. Prunskiene's visit to Norway, Denmark, and Sweden, the DAILY TELEGRAPH reports that her optimism is somewhat at variance with the cautious steps that the West intends to take, and indicates that Vilnius overestimated the help that Lithuania could receive in future.

The FINANCIAL TIMES points out that the financiers are watching closely the "war of nerves" over Lithuania. If it and the other Baltic republics become independent, the Western banks will have to tackle a series of complex issues. These republics' governments, the newspaper believes, will probably raise the question of their gold reserves, which were kept in the West. The newspaper recalls that Britain sold gold belonging to the three Baltic republics.

Paris—Analyzing the Western countries' attitude to Lithuania, the newspaper LIBERATION points out that "in the face of the confrontation between Vilnius and Moscow, the West is confused." "The Western countries' general attitude to this situation can be described as vigilant and cautious. They hope that the Lithuanian crisis will be settled as soon as possible, so that they do not have to take any retaliatory measures against Moscow, which they do not want to harm in any circumstances." "The community would prefer the Lithuanians to take a step toward talks," the newspaper quotes one Western diplomat as saying. Both Europeans and Americans are afraid of becoming drawn into a "dangerous spiral" by embarking on the path of issuing warnings to the USSR. "Even Western public opinion has no intention of mobilizing in support of the Lithuanians," the newspaper notes.

New York—The majority of Americans are in favor of maintaining good relations with the USSR regardless of the development of the Lithuania situation. This is indicated by the results of a public opinion poll carried out by TIME magazine and CNN television. Some 65 percent of those polled stated that the question of Lithuania's status is the Soviet Union's internal affiar.

The U.S. Administration will not take the step of recognizing Lithuania's independence, Robert Dole, leader of the Republican faction in the U.S. Senate, stated in an interview on ABC television. Asked to express his opinion on the possibility of Washington's recognizing an independent Lithuania, he said: "That will not happen. I do not think the president will recognize Lithuania."

Shevardnadze Addresses Foreign Ministry on Policy

WA2404191190 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 16, 18 Apr 90 pp 1, 9

[Speech by USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Eduard Shevardnadze at the 21st party conference at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the occasion of his selection as a delegate to the 28th CPSU Congress: "Consolidation of the CPSU Under Multiparty Conditions"]

[Text] **We publish below the speech by USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze at the 21st party conference of the USSR Foreign Ministry on his nomination as delegate to the 28th CPSU Congress. The speech will, we believe, be of extensive interest to the readers inasmuch as it touches on the most pertinent "painful" problems of foreign and domestic policy.**

This is the first democratic forum of the ministry's communists in receipt of the full-fledged mandate of trust of the whole collective.

I would like to say more than usual, and differently. Not in the traditional genre of a report containing an analysis and evaluation of the work of all subdivisions and imperious directives for the future—I renounce such a speech in advance. This will be a talk, I will try to make it such in any event, a heart-to-heart talk, a thinking out loud, something very personal, deeply felt, perhaps. I wish to share with you what I have never spoken about in public, reflections on what I have succeeded in doing and what I have been unsuccessful in and feelings apropos of hopes unrealized and promises unfulfilled.

I have already spoken about the fact that political life, as the sphere of interaction of political forces, was once reduced to nothing by the monopolization of the right to power and the truth. Now, when there is pluralism of opinions and political pluralism is becoming a fact of our reality, debate is acquiring its legitimate rights.

What will become of the party and, consequently, of each of us? What position will each of us occupy as its fate is being decided? How to act, what policy to pursue in order for the CPSU to remain the leading force consolidating society and the country under the conditions of the incipient multiparty system?

However much we ask such questions and however we attempt to answer them, the entire immense complex of them cannot shield us from the most important thing—perestroyka and its life and death. What I have just said may have been putting it strongly, but it is in principle correct: We are talking about the life and death of perestroyka. The question of the party and its future is inseparable from this. Everything is interconnected here. Continuation of the radical reforms in the country, with renewal of the party. Perestroyka in the party, with the reforms in our country.

Any debate, especially one involving such problems, should have a precise starting position and a clear goal. Truths are born in argument, although not just any of them may be acceptable since not just any promises an optimistic, healthy outlook.

What kind of truth do we need? In other words, what kind of outlook?

The answer was formulated in the Open Letter of the CPSU Central Committee to the country's communists—the prospect of and need for consolidation on a basis of principle.

We are asked, and our presidium is receiving the following written inquiries: How was this letter adopted? There are requests for an explanation of the "technique": There was no Central Committee plenum but the letter was published on behalf of the party Central Committee. I took part together with other comrades in the preparation of this letter and I know how it all took place.

The original draft letter differed considerably both in form and in content from that which was published. It was sent out to all members of the party Central Committee, Central Committee candidates, members of the Auditing Commission and first secretaries of oblast party committees and the central committees of parties of the union republics who are not members of the Central Committee. They all sent back observations, proposals, and evaluations in response. With these in mind, additional work was performed on the draft. This was a very complex and, I would say, contradictory process. The enlarged meetings of the Politburo were not without debate. Thus did this document emerge—the result of the collective work of all party activists, the party's command staff.

Now as to the substance, and this will be an answer to the second part of the question.

The alternative to consolidation is delineation or division. I cannot, I refuse to give this priority. This way—delineation and division—I personally emphatically brush aside as utterly hopeless and as having catastrophically revealed its historical bankruptcy. The lessons of that same history require of us an unambiguously precise interpretation of concepts. Such as the basis in principle of consolidation, say.

We know the past results of the slogan of adherence to principle in defense of party unity. The consequences of its practical realization were persecution for dissidence and expulsion from the party ranks and then expulsion from life. Terror, mass punitive measures, the grief of families and whole peoples. It was the ferocious, uncompromising struggle for principles which ultimately undermined them. As a result, while preserving the semblance of formal unity, the party found itself split, and no outwardly unquestioning obedience of the party members deprived them of inner protest and disagreement. Two standards of behavior and social existence joined battle and came to blows between themselves. A split ripened and took formal shape in the main component of the party organism—human hearts and minds.

It was from this inner protest and rejection of ingrained defects, incidentally, that the grains of the policy which we call perestroyka began to show through. And the majority, acquiring a vote, supported the initiators of perestroyka through unconcealed criticism of the current practices. Thus did the prerequisites for the informal unity of the party and the real, not imaginary, ideological and political cohesion of the communists conditioned by unity of goal take shape. Unity of professed goal and fidelity to it—this is the sole criterion, practical compliance with which makes people's formal association a real political party.

The main purpose of our party is perestroyka and its success and irreversibility.

An emphatic opponent of all purges and divisions, I believe that if there has to be a delineation in the party, it should only be on the criterion of attitude toward this main goal and main mission of ours. I would not, generally, abuse the word "delineation." We should be more cautious with it when it is a question of life and living people. Everything is always more complicated here than appears to the devotees of simple solutions. "Are you for the revolution, for socialism?" a person was once asked, and if he, while answering in the affirmative, voiced even the least disagreement with the methods and means, he was put down as an enemy of the revolution with all the consequences ensuing from this. The tragic experience of the defamation of associates by label should have taught us circumspection at least. Let us think carefully about the fact that in dividing people into "radicals" and "conservatives" we could be repulsing or isolating loyal allies and thereby really splitting the party.

With what danger is such a split fraught and to whose benefit is it?—This is by no means a rhetorical question. I have said repeatedly and believe, as before, that if perestroyka fails, dictatorship is possible. However much we brush aside such a forecast, history does not allow us to forget it. It testifies also to the fact that any time supporters of reforms, even if adhering to different views on the ways and means of their realization, but allies in what is most important, enter into fratricidal discord, weakening the alliance, the enemies of renewal have availed themselves of this and rolled the country back.

Consolidation and the unification of the forces of perestroyka are imperative mainly because a lack of unity and the mutual exhaustion of natural allies create conditions which are the most propitious possible for the actual enemies of perestroyka and the democratization and renewal of our society. Let there be no doubting that they exist. Manifestos have been made public, actions are being mounted. On a practical level an attack on the country's leaders is under way—not only from the left but from the right also. Regret is even being expressed that the Central Committee February Plenum did not remove certain members of the leadership, the foreign minister included.

I shall be as honest as possible with you. I say once again that fate has presented me with the happy opportunity of working in a splendid outfit of excellent people and high-class specialists, to whom I am much obliged both as a man and a minister. It is not for me to judge how I have availed myself of this opportunity but one thing I may say surely and plainly: For all that we have failed to achieve or, perhaps, done wrongly or not done at all the minister is responsible. I will not evade responsibility and am not concerned for my personal fate. And the

savage expressions of the opponents of perestroyka concerning, say, me, and some of my colleagues also, do not embarrass me. There are others—millions—at whom our home-made "ultras" are striking, and it is here that maintaining composure is impossible. Because in appealing to the masses, who are experiencing many difficulties, and taking advantage of their unhappiness, they are deliberately throwing a spark into the powder keg. And no one can calculate the consequences of a social explosion capable of igniting not only befogged minds but also the giant stockpiles of nuclear and chemical weapons and nuclear power stations and the zones already weakened by environmental and natural disasters and regions shaken by interethnic strife.

Disagreements on tactical grounds are not a reason for delineation and are not an obstacle to consolidation. The sole possible basis in principle therefore, in my opinion, is devotion to an important idea and significant goal. But what could be more significant than the goals and ideas of perestroyka? Only unification on this basis will recreate an efficient political party. Only such a party will, even under multiparty conditions, preserve the essentially informal—truly leading and consolidating—role. Only by having secured it for itself, that is, having obtained truly nationwide support, will it be able in alliance with all healthy social and political movements and parties on a broad democratic basis to devise and implement the strategy of the renewal of our state. Only as such, and none other, internally truly cohesive, will it be able to weaken and reduce to nothing the actions of negative forces, whose emergence is inevitable under the conditions of political pluralism.

I shall cite an amusing, but highly indicative fact. Young men from the "Vzglyad" [TV] program asked us to accord them an opportunity to observe, camera in hand, our life from within, so to speak. To see and show "how it is done." Believing that the country should know how we work, we agreed. And immediately a critical chorus chimed in: "Why 'Vzglyad?'" This is nothing new for us now. We have often heard recently: "What is going on? The foreign minister is in the press so often, and just look at the publications! OGONEK, ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI!!" Why does nobody say that my interviews and articles appear in the NEW YORK TIMES, THE WASHINGTON POST, LE FIGARO, in the NATO journal even—this is considered normal. But the fact that an interview appeared in OGONEK, this is, you know, absolutely appalling.

I recall a former chief editor of PRAVDA complaining at Politburo meetings: I've had enough, we are tired of Shevardnadze speeches, his continual interviews, statements, and speeches at official activities! As if it were a question of a pulp-fiction writer's urge for publicity, not the normal practice for the diplomatic community of familiarizing the public with foreign policy matters. We are developing this practice and conducting a dialogue with everyone—through PRAVDA, through IZVESTIYA, through other publications. But critics are for some reason keeping a count of publications in OGONEK and MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, clearly discerning in this some "wrong" tendency. I have a single tendency: to converse with all. This is the norm and rule of democracy. And they extend to the "Vzglyad" program, as to everyone.

It is a question of it being necessary to work with all honest people who take perestroyka to heart and dream about a renewal of society, the new socialism, the new character of our society and our state. Work and help them effect the great cause of glasnost. So that diplomacy ceases to be for the people a secret beneath seven seals, so that within permissible limits at least the appearance, the faces of their servants will be revealed to them. So that the foolish myths concerning it disappear. Maybe it does not wholly come off, maybe some questions are utterly naive, unacceptable, perhaps, and the answers not all that successful and maybe we are criticized for them—this is not the most dreadful thing. What is most dreadful is indifference, when no one criticizes anybody, no one offends anyone. When pseudo-criticism conceals either one's own hollowness or self-centered interests.

We have crossed this frontier. We have overcome indifference. There are no indifferent people in the country. And although the debate is putting people on different sides, this is not grounds for disorder. When a big movement begins, some people have to set an example. By the nature of our activity, owing to our professional "genetics," we are oriented toward dialogue and a search for a solution of difficult questions and the untying of the most complicated knots. For this reason I believe that the Foreign Ministry and our party organization could set an example of tolerant social and political dialogue and extensive cooperation with our country's healthy political forces.

Permit me now to fix your attention on one further matter. All these years, as head of the Foreign Ministry, I have been and remain a member of the Soviet leadership. And when in society, and in our collective also, people ask increasingly often whether we were right to begin perestroyka, they are asking me also. This is essentially no longer a question but a holding to account.

There is objective information, which earlier we could only guess at. And although each of us in the area of work assigned him—whether in the center or in the republics—had to deal daily with breakdowns in the operation of structures and systems, the overall state of affairs was concealed from us. Having made a thorough investigation of the situation, we saw for ourselves that the edifice of society and its supporting structures were in perilous condition. It could, of course, have been pretended that all was in order and that nothing would happen, but common sense demanded that the alarm, the red light be switched on. Believe me, I know what the situation is like in the country now, how much more complex it is than it was seen to be initially. Nonetheless, had I personally a chance to begin everything from the beginning, I would once again advocate perestroyka. I saw and continue to see no alternative to it.

Accusations are being heard increasingly often now of slowness, inconsistency, a lack of boldness and decisive action, and so forth. It is also being said that perestroyka has not only revealed our inveterate ailments but has also intensified them. Indeed, I could agree with this to some extent, but, as a person who has long been associated with the concerns of practical policy, I know full well that at any moment one is dealing with a specific situation in which some things are possible, but other things are simply inconceivable and unrealistic. I have always in principle proceeded and continue to proceed from the fact that perestroyka is not an act of the moment, not a great leap forward, and that stages and a gradual approach in its implementation are essential. I am well aware that unduly abrupt spurts from one condition to another precisely in a transitional period have resulted in failure for a whole number of countries.

There is, of course, another viewpoint expressed by the adage: "You can't jump a precipice in two leaps." But one leap, that is, the reformation of society, must, I believe, be well prepared. A well-prepared runup and reliable safeguards are essential, and the jump itself has to be practiced pretty well for a record jump. It is all these and many other conditions which are being created in the country currently, by its foreign policy included.

Optimism today is not in fashion. On the contrary, many people are competing in pessimism and in making the most terrifying forecasts. I am not their partner in this. My vision of the future is optimistic, of the economic future at least. The new economic structures and mechanisms are still taking shape. A legal base of the reforms is being created. There are already laws on property, the land and leasing, and a number of very important enactments on economic relationships is at the doorstep. They are starting to take effect, but it will be some time yet before people sense the changes for the better. We are faced with making an extraordinarily complex maneuver in the sphere of pricing, the most difficult, perhaps, without which a market simply will not be formed. Everyone understands that this is a painful and unpopular action, but we have to make up our minds to embark on it, having made the greatest reduction in the costs which it could have for the needy strata of the population.

I would like to notify you that a joint meeting of the Presidential Council and the Council of the Federation examined a program of transition to a controlled market economy in our country. Tomorrow will be historic in this respect, perhaps. It incorporates a mechanism for the transition and such sections as freedom of enterprise, reform of pricing and credit-finance policy, pay and employment, the economic relations of the Union and the republics, the organization of production, financial and consumer markets, foreign economic relations, a system of social support of the population, and so forth.

This list alone testifies to the degree of radicalization of our management and economic life. I will not rush into assurances that this draft could immediately change things for the better, but it initiates steps for whose absence we are being so sharply criticized both in our society and outside the country. Yes, we are being criticized for the fact that, in the words of George Shultz, we are not "switching quickly enough from driving on the right to driving on the left." But the trouble is that on many of our highways you can only drive one way, this was the way these highways were built.

For many years heavy industry had the "green light"—perhaps this was right in its time, it is now difficult to say—but it subsequently proved too heavy for the people's well-being. One-sided progress in arms manufacture paradoxically weakened the country's security in its most important component—the situation of the citizen. While proud of having achieved military parity with the United States, we have forgotten for some reason that we cannot yet even dream of parity in disposable syringes, or, incidentally, in other most important essential items either.

I was pained by a television story showing how foreign currency was being collected for the treatment in the United States of a pilot who had accomplished an exploit in Chernobyl. We cannot treat him and help thousands of people who have suffered from radiation. In creating a nuclear industry and nuclear power engineering should we not at the same time have created adequate "nuclear medicine" also? Aside from the human casualties and political costs, the Chernobyl tragedy cost us R14 billion. And it is said that this is not yet the limit, that there will be further costs.

Critics of perestroyka are accusing us of betraying class principles, meanwhile the "class enemy" is supplying us with these same syringes, antiburn equipment, prosthetic appliances and wheelchairs, and sending doctors and bone marrow. I do not wish to remind you of the earthquake in Armenia, when we all—on both sides—remembered that we are simply people, members of a single worldwide, universal civilization. Perestroyka has restored to us our humanity and, together with it, hope of a better world, freed us from fear in the face of nuclear catastrophe and afforded us an opportunity in the fight against ecological catastrophe. In all these acquisitions there is a considerable proportion of our common labor. But the attitude toward what has been done is ambivalent, and I consider this a normal phenomenon.

It is normal when in the professional milieu of diplomats and foreign policy specialists there are arguments and various evaluations of one action or another are made. As professionals, we must treat our own recommendations with the utmost severity, analyze our steps, past and present, note our mistakes and take them into consideration in our work. But we are, after all, not only professionals. We are additionally people, patriots of our country. And it is, perhaps, more difficult for us than many others because we ourselves can look at ourselves with detachment, as it were, and see how our country is perceived in other countries and on other continents.

Why did Vladimir Ignatyevich Brovikov's speech at the Central Committee Plenum meet with a sympathetic

response among us? It was sincere, it was from the heart, from the soul, but it was more than just this. I can understand him because the belief that we are a great country and that we should be respected for this is deeply ingrained in me, as in everyone. But great in what? Territory? Population? Quantity of arms? Or the people's troubles? The individual's lack of rights? Life's disorderliness? In what do we, who have virtually the highest infant mortality rate on our planet, take pride? It is not easy answering the questions: Who are you and who do you wish to be? A country which is feared or a country which is respected? A country of power or a country of kindness?

It is difficult for me myself to answer these questions.

I remember returning from Geneva following the signing of the Afghan settlement agreements. I have never spoken about this. Just the two persons who were with me at that time know about this.

It might have seemed that I should have been happy: There would be an end to the caskets arriving in the country. The account of deaths and expenditure, which had reached R60 billion, would be closed. But, despite this, I felt profoundly depressed. When my comrades asked me what the matter was, I did not conceal what was on my mind: It was hard for me to see myself as a foreign minister who had signed by no means a victory agreement. Such had not been a frequent occurrence in the history of Russia and the Soviet Union. And I was further troubled by the thought of people whom we ourselves had nursed and roused to revolution and whom we were now leaving one-on-one with a deadly enemy.

What is true patriotism: Satisfying the arrogance of statehood by sending others' children to die in a foreign country or the courage to recognize mistakes and prevent new ones, spare young men, and restore the country's good name?

We live in a world of realities and a world of emotions. Realities dictate one line of conduct, feelings rise up against it.

I recall the storm of applause evoked by the words of one politician, whom I highly respect, to the effect that currently not a single question in the world can be decided without the participation of the Soviet Union, contrary to its interests even less. This is truly the case. But the whole point is how it is decided and at what price—for the Soviet Union itself. We need to think seriously about this.

We recently returned from a tour of Africa. We saw Angola and Mozambique. Comrades formerly thought about their own interests there, it would seem, passing them off as state and class interests. These countries now have the biggest and best-armed armies in the region and the most glaring public poverty. The most devastated economy. This is not where the greatness and, even more, moral strength of a power lies. Pride in us should be evoked by Soviet enterprises operating excellently in African countries and the abundance and high quality of Soviet goods on these markets. This is not, alas, the case. There is, on the other hand, a policy of pseudo-support which is disastrous for us. By weapons and arms, mainly.

I do not wish to say that all this was unnecessary. At the stage of the African peoples' struggle for liberation such a policy was justified. But different structures should have been created in parallel. We should have helped them build the economy, social infrastructure, and so forth. We have lagged behind very seriously here.

On this continent—and not only on this one—we had since time immemorial been rivals with the Americans. We are now attempting, and not unsuccessfully, to interact. But even in our milieu we are surrounded by an atmosphere of suspicion and accusations: "We are betraying our own ideals!" At each step I hear behind me the whispering: You have given way, sacrificed something somewhere, agreed to compromise somewhere—and other such words. We are criticized for ignoring this component of security or the other, military mainly. For unilateral concessions in the disarmament sphere. I most categorically reject such inventions.

There have been no concessions—anywhere, in anything, to anyone. As far as the sphere of security is concerned, I declare with all due responsibility that the country's defenses and its security have, as before, been made the cornerstone. It is merely the actual angle of vision of defense and security, which should be adequate to the status of a great power, which has changed. We are for a strong country. A strong country means a strong army. Strong, undoubtedly, in all its components, including, besides modern arms and high combat skills, fitting conditions of service and social life for each soldier, each warrant officer and each officer and general. Strong by recognition of the uniqueness of our mission—protection of the country against outside danger.

I do not know why but some people would very much like to drive a wedge between the military and diplomats. To this end attempts are being made to distort our statements against the use of the army in punitive operations within the country and the disagreements which arise when positions on disarmament issues are being formulated.

Disagreements and arguments are the norm in any creative undertaking. And if they arise at department leader level, which is perfectly natural, this by no means signifies that we are rent by insurmountable antagonism. On the contrary, we speak and act as a united front—the Foreign Ministry, Defense Ministry, KGB, Military-Industrial Commission and other defense establishments and departments. Their representatives are not simply our equal partners in the negotiating process but sovereign coauthors of our successes. Unfortunately, not everyone knows that the most inventive solutions of the tightest, most complicated disarmament problems are suggested to us by our comrades from the General Staff and leaders of the Defense Ministry. The basis of the

unfair accusations are frequently the ignorance and incompetence of our opponents and our critics.

We are being presented with a bill, for example, for the INF Treaty. For the fact that we are destroying 1.5-2 times more missiles than the Americans. Why more, I shall not at this time explain. Much has been said about this. However, not everyone knows that at the most crucial stages of the negotiations—I myself requested this of Mikhail Sergeyevich—Sergey Fedorovich Akhromeyev, chief of the General Staff at that time, was with me. He participated in the adoption of the most crucial decisions, including directly at the negotiations. So we worked and are working collectively, collegially. As to arguments, it is not they which are costing me and my colleagues sleepless nights—what is distressing is that in expressing themselves this way many people are ignoring the actual interests of our security. And since there are many of them, it is for all of us—both military and diplomats—many times more difficult to defend its real interests.

I know how much the war in Afghanistan cost us. Who can calculate how much the confrontation with the United States cost? Or with China, on the border with which—7,500 km—we have over two or three decades built a colossal military infrastructure? How much does this cost? Tens or hundreds of billions? No one has counted. But this is, after all, public money. It is very much needed today, as it was then. Or take the long time spent by our forces in Czechoslovakia and Hungary and the increased manufacture of chemical arms, given that the Americans had ceased to do this in 1963. I know the cost of the cold war in its ruble and political equivalents. Praying unduly assiduously to the idols of pseudo-ideology, we made our people, the whole country, destitute. The destitution and impoverishment of the people are not factors of their security. In seeking an end to the "cold war" we will give them much more than they could be given by false pride from the awareness that we could thrash everyone.

The Soviet leadership is acutely aware of its responsibility for the country's reliable security, and we can pursue only a policy which strengthens this security. And here also we need to return to the road common to all mankind, the road of progress. Outdated systems and unrealistic doctrines will not save us. We need primarily to afford the country and the people an opportunity to breathe and think, to develop science and technology, to educate the youth and to provide a tolerable living standard for the needy. The time has come to recognize that there can be no parity between the two countries unless they are backed by comparable amounts of national product and comparable levels of scientific and technical development.

In evaluating the good sense of one agreement or another and one so-called "concession" or another we must also take into consideration the sort of situation which will take shape for us if there is no such agreement, if this concession is not made.

The comrades who are participating in the negotiations on a 50- percent reduction in strategic offensive arms know how difficult they are and how complex the unsolved problems are. Particularly in respect of air- and sea-launched missiles.

Some of our colleagues are demanding of us: "No compromises!" Their reasons are not those one rejects out of hand. But there is no escaping the main question: "If there is no treaty, will this be to our benefit or not?" What will the correlation of forces be in several years unless we halt the arms race, particularly in the sphere of cruise missiles? Unless we succeed in establishing some inhibitors, some boundaries, how will we sustain all this? What is our real interest? Where do our national interests lie in the direct and broad, not indirect and narrow, meaning of this word? We need to very seriously look into all these questions. We have yet to learn to consider all strategic factors and to look to the future. What could happen in 10 or 30 years time under the conditions of the growth of the scientific and technological revolution and our present backwardness in this sphere?

It is well known on what questions people are taking issue with us and what ideas are being contested currently. The idea of the supremacy of values common to all mankind and the deideologization of interstate relations. Freedom of choice and renunciation of a policy of strength. Let's abandon all this and return to principles, the blind following of which engendered confrontation which has brought us to the brink.

The events in East Europe have now been added to all these questions. Yes, they are evoking very complex feelings. But oversimplification invariably arises here. Unpopular leaders should have been removed, we are told. Removed, but how? By the former methods? Should we have committed troops once again, thrown on the scales not only the authority of perestroyka but also human lives?

Justified concern? Undoubtedly. Is there a solution? Undoubtedly, there is. We will seek and find it on the paths of a reorganization of the structure of security in Europe which properly ensures our national interests and collective security. We continue to have quite good business relations with the allied countries. Of course, profound changes will occur in our alliance, and our cooperation and interaction will be built on a new basis. And if we pursue the right policy and do not make mistakes, we will not have to worry about the future of our relations with the East European countries. We can and will know how to build really civilized, equal relations with these countries. We have emerged with dignity from the upheavals which have occurred, having preserved good prospects for the development of political and trade and economic relations and for the formation of new—equal and mutually respectful—relations.

The concern which Soviet people are experiencing in connection with the development of German affairs and the prospects of the unification of the two German states is understandable. Despite the high dynamics of the

changes in this field and the complex new alignment of forces, Soviet diplomacy has secured for itself the right and opportunities to influence the solution of the German question. We understand full well that we need to find a solution which is accepted by the Soviet people and which gives them confidence that there will be no new military threat to us from German soil.

There is no more important or crucial cause for Soviet foreign policy currently than the creation, together with other states, of a new system of security in Europe. We are sure that this can be done on the basis of the all-European process and the Helsinki Final Act.

The "two-plus-four" mechanism, yes, such a mechanism has been created, has already begun to operate. Active consultations with the other participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe on the possible structures of interbloc security, the synchronization of all-European transformations with the development of the process of German unity and so forth are under way. The agreement reached on the continued presence of allied forces on German territory and the positive attitude of the majority of countries toward the idea of the creation of an all-European center for averting the danger of war, an all-European council and a ministerial committee are important.

Looking back at the years of perestroyka, we may say with satisfaction that, as a whole, Soviet foreign policy has accomplished its main basic mission—the creation of the conditions most conducive to internal transformations in the country. The situation today is such that external circumstances are nowhere an impediment to our perestroyka. On the contrary. We have smooth, stable relations with essentially all states without exception. It is particularly gratifying that many problems in relations with neighboring countries which existed earlier have been removed.

There is, however, the other side of the coin. Yes, the threat of war has been moved back. The "cold war" is becoming a thing of the past. Military arsenals and military spending are being reduced—in the last two years we have reduced the latter 14 percent. These are real reductions, not propaganda. Countries' militarization levels, ours included, are declining. Military confrontation is on the wane. All this is very well, but we are noticing that a mood of complacency is emerging in a particular part of society. This cannot fail to cause concern. We are, after all, only at the start of the road. The arms race has not been halted, it continues to eat up a huge proportion of national income.

In order to halt the process of the destruction of ecosystems it is necessary at all costs to have found by the year 2000 some $800- 900 billion. It is this amount which is spent annually on arms. This is why it is so necessary to halt the arms race. It is becoming beyond the means even of such an economically strong country as the United States and is rolling it back, whereas countries with a nonmilitarized economy are surging sharply ahead.

Despite the outward prosperity of a number of developed countries, which are scoring big successes in the assimilation of new technology and the enhancement of their citizens' living standard, a catastrophic situation is taking shape in the world- economic system. Ecological depression is being superimposed on it .

We do not have the right to slacken our efforts to bring an end to the arms race and wind down plans for building new international relations. The new political thinking is in action. In continuing to perfect its instruments we are obliged to formulate an effective concept of new economic and environmental-protection thinking. Relations with science and the incorporation in our practices of the intellectual potential of the country and the world are urgent for us, as before. Problems of the third world require more serious attention. We closely link all this with an improvement in the work of our department.

A few words about my nomination for election as delegate to the party congress. Considering it for myself a high honor to represent Soviet diplomacy at the party forum, I am profoundly grateful to the collectives which nominated me. And although there have been proposals that I run elsewhere, what is most important for me is your attitude and the evaluations of our collective. If I am rejected, I will not say that I would accept this with delight, but I will regard any decision of yours as fair and objective.

Deputy Foreign Minister Discusses Military Costs

LD2404202190 Moscow TASS in English 1958 GMT 24 Apr 90

[By TASS Correspondent Mikhail Kochetkov]

[Text] New York (United Nations) April 24 TASS—Reductions in military expenditures will secure long-term "peace dividends" through lowering budget deficits and curbing inflation, thus ensuring higher growth rates throughout the world, a Soviet deputy foreign minister said today.

Ernest Obminskiy was addressing a special session of the UN General Assembly on international economic cooperation.

He said the advancement of new political thinking in world affairs "has allowed the Soviet Union to cut its defence budget by 14 per cent this year. The United States also has real possibilities to reduce its military spending."

"The process of international detente and the settlement of regional conflicts also permit to reduce military expenditure in developing countries where the overall strength of the armies approaches 20 million people," Obminskiy said.

"It is estimated that the purchase of weapons accounts for nearly 25 per cent of the overall foreign debt of middle-income developing countries.

"Discussions of 'peace dividends' will bear sense and perspective if we all together achieve success in the priority area—disarmament based on mutual trust and a total ban on any military adventures, which darken the political skies of our planet.

"In 1988-1989, the Soviet Union took specific steps to alleviate the debt burden of developing countries in the total amount of R14 billion.

"Additional measures are being considered to reduce the debt of the least developed countries, mostly in Africa, which are recipients of Soviet credits.

"Notwithstanding considerable difficulties of the transition period, faced by the Soviet economy, we continue to provide aid to the Third World. The USSR Supreme Soviet has allocated R9.7 billion in aid for 1990. This aid constitutes an important element of our foreign policy."

Obminskiy said the Soviet Union favours the "internationalisation of approaches to development problems, including aid and debt issues."

He called for the establishment of a broader basis for the coordination of countries' economic activity and the engagement of all groups of countries in this process.

Speaking about the creation in the Soviet Union of necessary prerequisities forr the integration of the Soviet economy into the world economy, the deputy minister expressed hope that "active involvement of the USSR and other East European countries in the world economy would promote its balanced and stable development for the benefit of all members of the international community."

Obminskiy called on the General Assembly session to "help reach an economic consensus reflecting the global balance of interests and based on realistic assessments of the objective processes of the world economic development."

Forum on European Economic Cooperation Viewed

PM2404125290 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Apr 90 Second Edition pp 1, 6

[Own correspondent Ye. Grigoryev report: "The Score for Europe: Notes From a Conference on Economic Cooperation"]

[Text] Bonn, April—For three long weeks the silhouette of Beethoven adorned the large "Maritime" hall at the hotel and congress center of that name in Bonn. Why did the image of the great composer overshadow a very prosaic conference on economic cooperation in Europe? Was it perhaps because representatives of the 35 states participating in the Helsinki process were seeking a harmony of interests and working on composing a future European life?

The FRG capital had not formerly seen such a large and prestigious international conference. The forum attracted many prominent figures from European countries. It was unusual in its composition, too. Alongside diplomats and representatives of other state institutions, scholars and lawyers filled the auditoriums and halls of the "Maritime." But most of all there were businessmen, people from the business world, those who have to translate the Bonn forum's agreements into the language of practice.

The conference's concluding document argues that the necessary guidelines for the development of mutually advantageous and equal partnership in Europe have been formulated in Bonn. The document recognizes the link between political pluralism and the market economy. Commitment is expressed to the principles of multiparty democracy, the rule-of-law state, and economic activity which asserts human dignity and is free from forced labor and discrimination. A number of tasks are set forth concerning budgetary, financial, foreign, and domestic policy, social justice, and ecology.

West German commentaries, as if on someone's prompting, invariably welcome the reference to "full recognition and protection of all forms of ownership, including private ownership, and the right of citizens to own and enjoy property." The impression is that some people at the conference wanted to make this question a stumbling block. So, in contrast to past years, it was not our side that was trying to engage in "ideologization" of particular provisions in the concluding document. But the new political thinking makes it possible to show flexibility and make reasonable compromises where there was formerly apparently no room for them. For the first time the document reflects the problems of the conversion of military sectors. The participating states note the new opportunities for cooperation especially in the sphere of consumer goods production arising, in particular, from the switching of military production to the production of civilian output.

The Soviet Union has pioneered the new area of activity. During the final days of the Bonn forum's work, a press conference was held by the leaders of the Munich fairs. They spoke about the Soviet "Conversion-90" exhibition being held in the Bavarian capital, where the potential of 300 of our defense enterprises for the production of civilian output is on show.

The "Maritime" conference did not, of course, resolve all the issues of economic cooperation in Europe. In effect it avoided the problem of Cocom with its notorious blacklists on exports of many types of modern output to the Warsaw Pact countries, and especially the Soviet Union. But whichever West European representative you listen to, whether diplomats or business people, they are all against this anachronism and all realize that it hampers normal East-West cooperation.

For us it is important that many decisions and recommendations of the Bonn document are in harmony with perestroyka and have a direct bearing on the renewal of the USSR's economy. The Soviet participants in the conference believe that the document will enable us to

participate more vigorously and boldly, knowledgeably and on the basis of the rules of world commerce, in all foreign economic affairs.

So the score has been composed for all-European economic cooperation. A significant step has been taken along the path to the European future.

'New Atlanticism' Causes Disagreement in NATO

PM2404105890 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
24 Apr 90 First Edition p 6

[Vladimir Peresada dispatch under the rubric "Our Correspondents Comment": "Atlantic Theme With a European Accent"]

[Text] Brussels, 23 Apr—It is a busy time at NATO's Brussels headquarters. Military-political services and the analytical apparatus have been set the task of preparing recommendations on two questions in a very short space of time: how Atlantic solidarity will be implemented in the context of the present changes in Europe, and what security system there should be on the continent in the new conditions.

The questions at issue occupied a central place during meetings held the other day by the NATO countries' leaders. But it turned out that there was no unanimity on them.

The touchstone for the mood in NATO was represented, on the one hand, by the talks between the U.S. president and the British prime minister, and on the other hand, those between the French president and the FRG chancellor. G. Bush came out very resolutely in favor of the idea of the "new Atlanticism," which presupposes the stepping up of NATO's political functions with a leading role for the United States, which would mean maintaining and perhaps increasing the U.S. influence in Europe. M. Thatcher, it emerged, takes the same view.

A different approach was revealed by the meeting between F. Mitterrand and H. Kohl. Although it was known already that the majority of NATO countries, especially France, offer as an alternative to the "new Atlanticism" the idea of strengthening the "European defensive structure," the outcome of the meeting, according to THE NEW YORK TIMES, "proved frankly unexpected." The point is that hot on the heels of the "new Atlantic consensus" between Washington and London and, so to speak, in despite of it, Paris and Bonn called for the acceleration of the formation of a political alliance of the 12 European Community countries, with a view to the pursuit of a united line in the sphere of foreign policy and security.

The differences are so obvious that the newspapers are already predicting that the NATO summit will probably be the scene of sharp clashes, even if the NATO apparatus formulates a compromise line. But that could happen even earlier: After all, if Paris is able to oppose the establishment of the "new Atlanticism" in NATO, London, for its part, is able to put a spoke in the wheel of the political integration of the "Twelve" and the strengthening of the "European defensive structure." Well, anything is possible. I think the touchstone will be the session of the Western European Union Council which opens in Brussels today—this is a defense organization to which the United States does not belong and which is regarded as just such a structure.

U.S. Case for Shunning UNESCO 'Unconvincing'

PM2504090390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
24 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent G. Charodeyev article, including remarks by V. Perfilyev, first deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, under the heading "The United States, Britain, and UNESCO"]

[Text] Quoting the U.S. State Department, THE WASHINGTON POST has reported that, after repeated analysis, the United States has decided to remain outside UNESCO because UNESCO is "still distinguished by a poor standard of work organization and demonstrates political prejudice in relation to Israel and the Western press."

Presenting the administration's conclusions, Assistant Secretary of State John Bolton said that there have been "few real changes, if any changes at all" since the United States withdrew from UNESCO at the end of 1984. J. Bolton said that the U.S. contribution, in the region of $50 million per year, would be hard to justify, "considering the way UNESCO spends its money." According to him, the organization's "imposing" bureaucratic apparatus with its staff headquarters in Paris eats up 70 percent of its funds. Only seven percent of UNESCO funds are used to fight illiteracy, which is the organization's main aim, the assistant secretary of state stressed.

In the opinion of the Bush administration UNESCO, which used to be headed by a representative of Senegal, is under the strong influence of "third world" countries; frequent conflicts have arisen in the organization lately with the United States and other Western countries.

In Paris, UNESCO Director General F. Mayor said that, in taking this decision, the United States "has not fully considered the changes made to UNESCO's program of action" or its organizational and structural reforms. He stressed that the "deferment" of the U.S. return to this organization will hamper the implementation of planned reforms.

Your IZVESTIYA correspondent spoke on the telephone to V. Perfilyev, first deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, and asked him to comment on the U.S. Administration's decision.

"It is the sovereign right of every state to decide whether it will join an international organization or not," he stressed. "That is probably how this should be seen by the world community. Why has this U.S. decision nevertheless caused confusion in many countries? First, so it

seems to me, because UNESCO is now the biggest forum of international intellectual cooperation. More states belong to UNESCO than to the United Nations (161, against 159 in the United Nations). In this situation, one is naturally puzzled by the U.S. stand in isolating itself from international cooperation in the spheres of culture, science, and education. This attitude is also causing perplexity in the United States itself, incidentally. For example, the U.S. National Academy of Sciences is in favor of returning to UNESCO, a U.S. committee of public figures in favor of a return to UNESCO has been set up, and so forth. Second, it should be pointed out that the U.S. Administration's arguments regarding the continued politicization of UNESCO appear highly unconvincing. Recent sessions of this organization's General Conference and Executive Council have seen a business-like, constructive exchange of opinions free of political emotion, and all decisions have been taken by consensus and supported by the official representatives of all states, West European states included...." [Perfilyev ends]

It is now known that Britain has announced that, in all likelihood, it will not be joining UNESCO in the coming year. In connection with the publication of a report prepared by the House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee, T. Sainsbury, parliamentary under secretary of state at the British Foreign Office, said: "We will continue to closely follow the development of events in UNESCO and wait for the day when we can join a reformed organization."

Britain, the Press Association has pointed out, left UNESCO in 1985, saying that the organization had "become too politicized, excessively bureaucratic, and badly organized."

Intensified Japan-U.S. Exercises Assessed

OW2604052690 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 19 Apr 90

[Kalinin commentary]

[Text] As has already been reported, the Japan-U.S. joint Air Force exercise started at Hyakuri Air Base [HAB] in Ibaraki Prefecture on 17 April. In this connection, Radio Moscow military commentator Kalinin writes as follows:

The current military exercise is characterized by the fact that it has been held at the HAB. Military exercises can be held at this base now because the Japanese Supreme Court finally decided last June to reject the local residents' protest against the construction of this air base after reviewing the appeal for over 30 years. As a result, Japan and the United States are now allowed to hold joint military exercises at all seven bases belonging to the Japanese Air Self-Defense Force.

Also noteworthy is the fact that the current military exercise at the HAB has been conducted simultaneously with the exercise held at Komatsu Air Base in Ishikawa Prefecture and also with the Rimpac-90 exercise, which is the multipurpose naval exercise conducted under the guidance of the United States. When all these facts are taken into consideration, we can say that joint exercises held between the Japanese Self-Defense Forces [SDF] and the U.S. Forces have now become more frequent and larger in scale.

I would also like to point out that the Japan-U.S. joint exercises have been conducted for 35 years now. As time passes, these exercises have become more complicated and strained in their details. Moreover, the number of exercises held every year has also increased. Four years ago, Admiral Hays, the commander in chief of the U.S. Forces Pacific at the time, stated that the joint program for Japan-U.S. exercises had been considerably expanded. This trend seems to have been further promoted.

As a recent example, we can cite the frequency of the Japan-U.S. joint use of the SDF's HAB. It is planned that from now on, the Japanese and American Air Forces will hold their joint exercises at the HAB four times a year. Meanwhile, the schedule for the joint use of other air bases in Japan has not been reduced.

Because military forces exist, we can understand that various military exercises constitute an important part of combat training. However, the point at issue is whether or not the scale and frequency of these military exercises conform to the genuine needs of national defense. From this standpoint, we don't think that the military preparations of either Japan or the United States can be justified.

As is known to all, the Soviet Union has unilaterally reduced its troop strength, including 120,000 troops stationed in the Soviet Far East. At the same time, it has limited the scale and frequency of the exerices of the Soviet troops. The military preparedness of the naval force has been remarkably reduced. Former Admiral (Laroche), director of the U.S. National Defense Intelligence Center, has admitted this fact in an interview with YOMIURI SHIMBUN. According to Director (Laroche), the scale of the preparedness of Soviet submarines, for example, has been reduced by half. It should not be forgotten that the Soviet Union reduced its military presence at Vietnam's Cam Ranh Bay last year. Even the Japanese Defense Agency has confirmed that the number of Soviet transport planes flying from the Soviet Far East to Cam Ranh Bay has decreased remarkably. Such flights were made every week in the past but they are flown only once a month now. According to KYODO NEWS SERVICE, Japanese military experts feel that such steps taken by the Soviet Union will defuse tension in the region.

When these facts are taken into consideration, the attempt of both Japan and the United States to increase their defense buildup, particularly in expanding the scale and increasing the frequency of joint exercises, cannot but be taken as an attitude of consciously ignoring the positive changes taking place in the international arena.

United States & Canada

Solton Terms Bush 'Wise Politician' on Lithuania

LD2504123590 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] Many differing and sometimes inconceivable opinions were expressed in the United States on the eve of Tuesday's [24 April] meeting between President George Bush and congressional leaders. The meeting was designed to discuss whether the administration should take punitive measures against the Soviet Union for cutting oil supplies and reducing gas deliveries to Lithuania or not. Yuriy Solton elaborates:

Some believed, and others hoped, that the President would speak against plans to grant the USSR the best favored nation status in trade, impose an embargo on grain sales to it and even postpone the U.S.-Soviet summit schedule for late May-early June. To tell the truth, we in Moscow awaited the administration's reaction with keen interest.

However, we believed that President Bush would not give up his restrained and well-considered approach, despite the pressure exerted on him since too much depended in the world on the state of Soviet-American relations to risk jeopardizing them. And the awaited news from Washington arrived. After his meeting with congressional leaders President Bush declared that he had no intention of taking any measures at the moment. It's a very complicated situation, he said, and too much is at stake. He doesn't want to make a mistake, said President Bush during a brief interview with reporters. The congressional leaders supported his stand.

I think President Bush is a wise politician, writes Yuriy Solton. He had reckoned with the mood of the American people, most of whom are in favor of maintaining good relations with the USSR, regardless of developments in and around Lithuania. He must have taken into account the attitudes of his NATO allies, many of whom did not support taking of American sanctions against Moscow.

There was a dissonance, though. Speaking in Los Angeles on Tuesday, Defense Secretary Richard Cheney declared that developments in and around Lithuania might lead to delaying for a couple of years the planned cuts in U.S. military spending. He even hinted at the possibility of serious complications at the talks on disarmament. But that was evidently his personal view. White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater has said that President Bush is firm in his intention to adhere to the agenda of the upcoming U.S.-Soviet summit, and that he categorically opposes any intervals in disarmament talks.

Mid-May is to see another round of negotiations between U.S. Secretary of State James Baker and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze. This will be the concluding phase of preparations for the upcoming Soviet-American summit.

Bush, Fitzwater on Lithuania, U.S.-USSR Ties

PM2504181990 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 26 Apr 90 p 3

[TASS correspondent O. Polyakovskiy report: "G. Bush: 'I Do Not Want To Make Mistakes'"]

[Text] Washington, 25 Apr—At a meeting with journalists on Tuesday, President Bush stated that he has no intention at present of imposing any sanctions in response to the steps taken by the Soviet Government over the situation in Lithuania. "This is a very complex situation. There is a great deal at stake and I do not want to make any mistakes," he said. The President stressed that he wants dialogue between the Soviet Union and Lithuania. G. Bush made this statement after a meeting with Congressional leaders at which the Lithuanian situation was discussed. According to administration officials, the discussion focused in particular on the possibility of slowing down the development of trade and economic relations with the Soviet Union in response to the ending of oil supplies and the reduction of gas supplies to Lithuania.

After the meeting with the President, Dante Fascell, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, said that the leaders of America's allies with whom President Bush had consulted in the past few days "are not ready for the introduction of any joint sanctions whatsoever." D. Fascell, who has previously supported resolute measures against the USSR, said that in the present situation he would not "recommend unilateral sanctions." "What conclusion should the Lithuanians draw from this?" one reporter asked Fascell. "I would not want the Lithuanians to nurture hopes that their problems will be resolved thanks to some magic formula of economic sanctions or political actions by the United States. That will not happen in any event and I believe that it would be a mistake for the United States to take measures which would be perceived as escalation," he replied.

As public opinion polls show, the introduction of any measures which could harm U.S.-USSR relations does not enjoy support among Americans. [A shorter version of this report carried on page 4 of PRAVDA 26 April First Edition under the headline "President Rejects Sanctions" incorporates the following additional paragraph: "White House Press Secretary Marlin Fitzwater stated at a briefing: 'The President stressed that he does not plan to make changes to the arms control process. He pointed out that the United States and the Soviet Union have discussed arms control even at the most difficult times in their relations. Such talks ease tension in U.S.-USSR relations and must continue. We believe that the leaders of Congress fully support the President's actions. They called for restraint and steadfastness and urged against imprudent actions.' In reply to a question, he reported that trade talks between the two countries are continuing."]

U.S. Media Cited on Bush's Lithuania Policy

PM2504160090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report followed by dispatches from IZVESTIYA correspondents V. Nadein in Washington and A. Shalnev in New York: "Around the Events in Lithuania"]

[Text] **The U.S. President's Decision**

[Begin TASS report] On Tuesday [24 April] U.S. President G. Bush met with leaders of the American Congress and discussed the Lithuania situation with them. He stated after the meeting, AP reports, that he will not at present introduce sanctions against the Soviet Union in response to the Kremlin's actions with regard to Lithuania, because they could be counterproductive. "I am concerned that our actions should not force the Soviet Union to take steps that would set back the entire cause of freedom throughout the world," Bush stressed.

Pell, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, stated that the participants in the meeting supported G. Bush's opinion that "an escalation of the situation could be detrimental" to relations between the United States and the USSR. [end TASS report]

Washington

The day before, the world's news agencies reported that the President's meeting with Congress leaders, which was planned beforehand, would be a turning point in the U.S. attitude to the Soviet Union. Few people doubted that sanctions would provoke retaliatory measures by the Soviet side. The growth of mutual intolerance could destroy much, if not all, of the edifice of cooperation, which does not yet have firm foundations.

Looking at the emotional side of the matter, this is expressed most clearly in these words from the American President: "I do not want people looking back in 20 or 40 years' time to say: That is when it all went off course. That is when progress stopped."

The President also said that he sees the Lithuanian problem in a long-term context. "I would like to see progress in the Soviet Union going forward, without those elements that are opposed to Gorbachev and are prepared to do anything to destroy what has been created and turn back the block to the days we remember, when the spirit was one of cold war and confrontation."

THE WASHINGTON POST devoted a long article by its correspondent D. Remnick to the reaction in Lithuania. In particular, he singled out remarks by V. Landsbergis, who described the U.S. President's latest decision thus: "It is a political Munich."

Foreseeing the inevitability of such criticism both at home and abroad, Bush said: "I am worried about Poland's freedom. I am worried about freedom in the other Baltic states, whose incorporation (in the USSR) we have not recognized. I am also worried about ensuring that we do not do anything through careless actions that would prompt the Soviet Union to take steps that would set back the entire cause of freedom throughout the world."

The President did not conceal from his audience the fact that he was considerably influenced by the fact that this is happening only five weeks before the planned summit meeting. He also took into account the considerable tension of the political and economic situation in the Soviet Union. "These are very complex times," the President said, referring not only to the situation in the USSR, but also to worldwide problems in their present state.

Contrary to the predictions of a number of commentators, the leaders of the two chambers supported the President's political analysis and practical actions. And although they both belong to the Democratic Party, which is opposed to the Republican Bush, the leaders of the chambers made a joint statement in support of the President after the meeting at the White House.

At the same time the White House reaction testifies to the growing, though not yet publicly expressed, views of politicians in both the United States and Europe to the effect that, as THE WASHINGTON POST put it, the Lithuanians "have pushed the matter of their independence too quickly and too resolutely, and are too disinclined to compromise."

New York

According to an ABC Television correspondent, President Bush came to the meeting with Congress leaders "ready, though unwilling, to take measures against Moscow" in connection with Lithuanian events. "But the Congress leaders did not insist on these measures."

They are not alone. It transpires that the extensive and intensive consultations that the American President and his advisers held in recent days with the leaders of the countries allied with the United States in NATO, as well as with leaders of certain East European states, produced a clear result: The allies and East Europeans are not inclined to support actions against the Soviet Union.

These factors, as well as the fact that, according to a series of public opinion polls, Americans in general are not prepared to accept a deterioration in relations iwth Moscow, apparently played the main role in President Bush's decision, as ABC Television put it, "to take no decision."

I asked Professor Robert Legvold, director of the Harriman Institute of Long-Term Studies of the Soviet Union at Columbia University, to comment on the White House's decision, or rather nondecision. This is what he said:

"I believe it is a reasonable position. It is very important for the White House to maintain its flexibility and show

restraint in conditions where the stakes for the Soviet leadership are extremely high. This is no time for us to strike a pose and play to the gallery.

"If the President were to announce sanctions of some kind now and if those sanctions did not produce the result that could be expected, the next step would then have to be tougher and even more painful, but I must say, on the other hand, that if the situation over Lithuania deteriorates and no compromise is found, if the Soviet leadership escalates the tension, Bush will feel increasing pressure for measures to be adopted. Such measures will become a political necessity.

"All the same, I am optimistic, in particular about the possibility of reaching a compromise on Lithuania. Moscow and Washington, as I see it, will manage to avoid serious complications that would distract their attention from such problems as, for instance, arms control."

I would like to add to what Professor Legvold said that, as representatives of the administration made known on Tuesday, the President has not yet taken a final decision, that he is, so to speak, reserving the right of reply, and that he could announce actions at any time.

Bessmertnykh Receives U.S. Ambassador Matlock

LD2504115690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1100 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 25 Apr (TASS)—Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, USSR first deputy minister of foreign affairs, today received Jack Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union, at the latter's request. Issues relating to current and forthcoming Soviet-U.S. political contacts were discussed, including at the level of USSR foreign minister and U.S. secretary of state.

U.S. House Resolution on Jerusalem Condemned

LD2504142690 Moscow TASS in English 1357 GMT 25 Apr 90

[By TASS political news analyst Albert Balebanov]

[Text] Moscow April 25 TASS—The U.S. House of Representatives has endorsed a resolution supporting moves to turn Jerusalem into Israel's capital. This happened a month after a similar resolution was issued by the U.S. Senate.

It is noteworthy that members of the U.S. Congress ignored numerous warnings both on the part of the Bush administration and many foreign leaders, including those of Arab countries, that such steps undermine international efforts towards establishing a Middle East peace process.

The U.S. congressmen's actions also contradict the stance of President Bush who does not recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital and believes that the city's final status should be determined through talks between the Jews and the Arabs.

Even mayor of the Jewish part of Jerusalem Teddy Kollek admitted that the U.S. resolution does not serve any useful purpose.

It did not pass unnoticed that many prominent members of the U.S. Congress did not support the action of colleagues and even condemned it.

Robert Dole leader of the Republicans in the Senate, described this step as erroneous and posing a threat to Bush administration efforts connected with the opening of peace talks in the Middle East.

In the Arab east, the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives resoutions are viewed as a challenge to all Moslem peoples and as utter disregard for the legitimate historical rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

The U.S. congressmen's action is at variance with international law and with respective U.N. Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, passed in 1967-79, pointing to the unlawfulness of Israel's attempts to change the status of Jerusalem.

It seems that Clovis Maksoud, permanent observer of the League of Arab States at the United Nations, is right in describing the U.S. congressmen's decision as irresponsible.

Something else is also evident: through its decision the U.S. Congress virtually encourages Tel Aviv's annexionist policy. It is doubtless that the congressmen's actions were the consequences of backstage manoeuvres of the influential pro-Israeli lobby in support of the position of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir who asserted on March 4, this year, that East Jerusalem was an inalienable part of Israel.

Washington has lately come forward with a number of proposals and initiatives which are a manifestation of obvious headway towards realism in the administration's approach to Middle East problems.

The U.S. congressmen's actions, encouraging the Israeli extremists' desire to Judaise East Jerusalem, undermine the U.S. Government's attempts to make a constructive contribution to the quest for peace in the Middle East. Efforts to lend dynamism to the Middle East peace process are obviously not to the liking of some people in the United States.

U.S. Report on USSR Military Spending Cited

PM2404132190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "Report on USSR Economy"]

[Text] The Technology and National Security Subcommittee [as published] of the Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress has disseminated a report on the state of the Soviet economy prepared by specialists of the CIA and the U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency.

The report states, in particular: The USSR's GNP increased 1.5 percent in 1989, but the gap between output and consumer requirements is increasing. A two-year decline in the sphere of agricultural production has been halted. However, the overall increase in agricultural production last year proved insufficient to make a substantial impact on the availability of food for the population in retail trade. Industrial production did not increase last year, owing directly to the state of labor discipline and the lack of economic incentives resulting from the shortage of consumer goods and the devaluation of the ruble. A drop in production in the fuel and energy sector has been noted for the first time since the forties.

The balance of trade deficit in convertible currency increased. This is due to a sharp increase in imports. The net foreign debt in hard currency reached 32 billion rubles by the end of 1989. Western banks laid down tougher credit terms for the Soviet Union, and the reasons for this are named as the slow pace of economic reforms, the intensifying interethnic conflicts, and the lack of information on Soviet enterprises and foreign trade organizations.

In 1989 the real reduction in military spending in the USSR amounted to four-five percent, and appropriations for purchases of combat hardware fell six-seven percent.

Senator Bingaman, chairman of the Technology and National Security Subcommittee, declared with regard to the drop in Soviet military spending noted in the report: "We can no longer assert that there is no reliable evidence of Soviet military reductions. The facts are that the Russians are unilaterally implementing important measures aimed at slowing the arms race. This may be the most important of the measures being implemented by Gorbachev. In the long term we may witness a period of economic revival. An important question now is how the United States and Western countries react to the military reforms and reductions being implemented by the Soviet Union."

RSFSR Leader Meets Former U.S. Official

PM2304083390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Talk Held"]

[Text] RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Foreign Minister V.M. Vinogradov received former U.S. Deputy Secretary of State R. Fairbanks 19 April. Questions of the organization of ties between the RSFSR and the United States in the economic, scientific, technical, and cultural spheres were discussed. Particular attention was devoted to possible participation by Russia's Siberian and Far Eastern regions in Pacific regional economic cooperation.

U.S., USSR Stances on Asian Force Cuts Eyed

PM2404102790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Vikentiy Matveyev "Political Observer's Opinion": "How Is Asia Worse Than Europe?"]

[Text] The U.S. National Security Council and the Pentagon recently prepared a document under the title "East Asian Strategic Initiative." It was marked secret but, as is often the case in the United States, its contents have been leaked to the press. NEWSWEEK in particular has informed its readers about the document in fair detail.

The document indicates the inevitability of cuts in the U.S. Armed Forces stationed in the Asian and Pacific region. The justification for this step is the conclusion that military conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union in the Pacific is unlikely. In this connection, the document says, the functions of the U.S. Armed Forces in the Asian and Pacific region must change. Henceforth they will serve as a "deterrent" with regard to threats that may arise in the region as a a result of local conflicts.

As we can see, the document signals an important revision of priorities in the Pacific and the Far East among official circles in Washington. Until now U.S. strategy for this region has been based on the premise that there exists a "Soviet threat." It is for precisely this reason that the U.S.-Japanese alliance has been maintained and strengthened for so many years and that the Pentagon's system of military strongpoints stretching from the Hawaiian islands to Thailand has functioned for so long.

In this sense the situation in the Asian and Pacific region has mirrored the situation seen on both sides of the line of confrontation in Europe for decades after the war.

But now the situation on the "old continent" has been transformed. An intensive collective search is under way to find ways to substantially reduce arms and armed forces and eliminate the state of military confrontation on the continent.

So why not try to do the same in the Asian and Pacific region?

Not less but, in some categories (primarily naval arms), more substantial forces are concentrated in this vast region than in Europe.

The need to reduce the forces in this region for the sake of the same constructive objectives being set with regard to the all-European process is no less obvious.

That is the aim of the Soviet Union's Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk initiatives. The proposals they contain are becoming increasingly relevant.

"Why do the changes taking place throughout the world not have any impact on the U.S. military presence in Asia?" This question was recently raised by Motofumi Asai, a former Japanese diplomat and now a scientist lecturing at Tokyo University.

Responding to the fresh winds of change, U.S. diplomacy has reacted positively to the Soviet Union's readiness to begin consultations on a range of issues concerning the situation in the Asian and Pacific region. At the moment, however, the situation has gone no further than diplomatic dialogue.

Meanwhile, our country has taken a series of unilateral measures to reduce its military presence in this region. It is currently implementing a program for 1989-1990 to reduce the numerical strength of the group of Soviet forces in the eastern part of the country by 200,000 personnel, including 120,000 personnel in the Far East. In all, 16 warships are being removed from our Pacific Fleet. We are prepared to take even more substantial demilitarization measures in this region but, clearly, it must be on a mutual basis with the United States. There is a limit to unilateral measures like these.

But Washington's recent announcements on this matter have been disappointing. Many U.S. press organs have responded in the same spirit to the U.S. Government measures. They write of their symbolic nature.

It is planned to withdraw 2,000 U.S. Air Force servicemen and approximately 5,000 ground forces auxiliary personnel from South Korea in 1991-1993. This is from the 43,000-strong U.S. contingent in South Korea. The United States intends to remove 7,000 servicemen (out of 50,000) from Japan. This is not very much in comparison to what our country is doing.

Washington points out that the United States deploys considerably fewer ground forces in the Asian and Pacific region than the Soviet Union. But should that come as any surprise? Our country has long land borders in this region, which, as is well known, the United States does not have. Moreover, the Soviet side has indicated its readiness to embark on extensive measures together with other countries to strengthen confidence in the military sphere and reduce arms and armed forces in the Asian and Pacific region. We do not lay claim to any superiority.

As far as the U.S. side is concerned, it is still trying to legitimize its naval presence in the region as a superior force. Washington makes no bones about this.

R. Lehman, head of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, who toured several countries in the region at the beginning of April, admitted in an interview that members of Congress are boldly speaking out in favor of reducing the U.S. naval presence in the Pacific and the Far East.

I think that the visit itself was prompted to a considerable extent by the growth of similar moods in the United States itself and in countries in the region concerned. The interview with R. Lehman was not encouraging. He does not admit the possibility of any substantial reduction in the U.S. Navy in the Pacific. First, in his opinion, "a navy is not as threatening as ground forces or nuclear weapons." And his second theory: "The Soviet Union's interests in the Asian and Pacific region are different from those of the United States and its allies."

Strange arguments. Surely there are nuclear weapons on board U.S. warships, to say nothing of submarines? And is it right in general to understate the potential of military fleets? If it were indeed a case of some secondary type of arms, Washington would hardly be likely to offer such resistance to accords on reducing U.S. naval forces.

Interests... If he was referring to the geographical and other specifics of a country, these interests certainly are unequal. However, every state without exception has an equal interest in safeguarding its own security. In Europe, awareness of this fact has made it possible to agree the basis for joint progress. Why can the same approach not be practiced in the Asian and Pacific region? How is Asia worse than Europe?

Commentator Calls Marti 'Electronic Warfare'

LD2304170590 Moscow World Service in English 1510 GMT 23 Apr 90

[Text] The United States has begun to broadcast television programs to Cuba with the help of transmitters on a balloon in the Straits of Florida. The idea behind this attempt is to seize a Cuban Television channel for daily broadcasting. Our Havana correspondent Viktor Gorbachev has more:

[Gorbachev, in Russian, fading into superimposed English translation] The American-Cuban electronic confrontation has turned into trench warfare. A couple of minutes after TV Marti under the U.S. Information Agency starts its programs every night Cuba jams the signal. Nothing but stripes can be seen on channel 13 that the Americans hope to seize.

The agency pays hundreds of thousands of dollars a week for a few minutes of broadcasting. The American Administration, leaning on its technological superiority, definitely hopes to get what it wants, but the Cubans have got a whole range of defensive means—they have only jammed so far.

Their government is displaying restraint and measuring response against American actions, but Havana is getting ready to face the worst. Significantly a foreign reporter has asked Fidel Castro at a news conference whether he

believes a surgical air raid on the Cuban jamming devices probable. Judging by the reply the Cubans can counter this, too.

The Bush administration is concerned by a shortage of time. If TV Marti's stable and clean reception cannot be ensured within three months Congress will stop financing the project. How absract is the talk that the United States may move from trench electronic warfare to other actions at any time?

TASS Reports Alaskan Radar Modernization

LD2504095990 Moscow TASS in English 0806 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] New York April 25 TASS—The U.S. Ration Corporation has received a Pentagon contract to modernise an early warning and surveillance radar system Cobra Dane at the Shemya Air Base, Alaksa.

According to the knowledgeable AVIATION WEEK AND SPACE TECHNOLOGY, the contract is worth 58.6 million dollars.

The Cobra Dane phased-array radar was activated in 1977. It is designed to gather data on the test launches of ballistic missiles. The corporation intends to install a new computer system at the facility to process information and signals.

China

Li Peng Ends Moscow Visit, Leaves for Leningrad

More on Gorbachev, Li Peng Meeting

OW2604111090 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1100 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Report by station's foreign affairs reporter on the meeting between Gorbachev and Li Peng at the Kremlin on 24 April]

[Text] The main event on the second day of the Chinese premier's stay in Moscow was his meeting with Gorbachev. At the meeting, the Soviet leader expressed satisfaction with the overall development of bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and China. Li Peng agreed with this assessment, saying that Soviet-Chinese relations have great potential.

During the meeting, Gorbachev gave an account of the present stage of Soviet reform. He said: We look at our past, our present, and the world around us. We draw lessons and borrow the experiences of others, but we take our own road. The Soviet leader continued: Naturally, I count myself among the people who have begun the policy of reform. The purpose of our quest is to renew and improve our society, while preserving the socialist choice. The present change is not inferior to the October Revolution, both in scale and depth. Gorbachev said emphatically: We strive to uphold this choice within the orbit of reform and in the legal process, and to avoid confrontation and violent consequences. This is the main thing now.

The two sides in the talks expressed their common view that no models or patterns exist for all countries to follow in implementing practical socialist ideas and principles. Each country has its own history, characteristics, and starting point and level of development. It is impossible not to consider this.

Gorbachev and Li Peng said: The flourishing development of Soviet-Chinese relations and the brisk good-neighborly cooperation between the two countries are in the interests of all other countries. They are an important factor leading to stability in the world political order. In particular, the agreement that has been signed on the guiding principles for reducing armed forces and strengthening trust in the military sphere in Chinese-Soviet border areas is vital to strengthening security in Asia.

Gorbachev and Li Peng noted the proximity of the positions of the two states on a broad range of topical international issues, which primarily refer to the tasks, which are of concern to all peoples, of restricting the arms race and averting nuclear weapons and the nuclear threat. Speaking of the upcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, the Chinese premier stated that China will welcome an agreement on reducing strategic nuclear weapons.

After the Soviet-Chinese meeting on Thursday [24 April], a ceremony on signing some documents was held in Moscow. The most important of those documents was a Soviet-Chinese plan on long-term economic, scientific, and technological cooperation for the period up to the year 2000.

Li Peng Speaks at Friendship House

OW2504140690 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] Li Peng, member of the Standing Committee of the Political Bureau of the CPC Central Committee and China's premier, continued his formal visit in the Soviet Union. On Tuesday, Soviet President Gorbachev received the distinguished guest from China. A number of documents were signed upon the completion of the Soviet-Chinese talks. One of the major documents is a long-term program determining the economic, scientific, and technical cooperation between the two countries until the year 2000. The program, which will lay the foundation for mutually beneficial relations in various industries, will orient both sides to develop cooperation in progressive, high-technology areas. In addition, the two sides signed an agreement on cooperation in the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes. Both documents were signed by Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Li Peng, China's premier. Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze and his Chinese counterpart Qian Qichen signed an agreement

on guiding principles for mutual reductions of troops and confidence-building measures in the military sphere along the Soviet-Chinese border, and a protocol on consultations between the two countries' foreign ministries. The two sides also signed some other joint documents.

On Tuesday evening, Li Peng met with Soviet social circles and activists of the Soviet-China Friendship Society at the House of Friendship in Moscow. Station reporters (Karipov) and (Demitriyev) report:

The Moscow House of Friendship has lately held receptions for many Chinese delegations. However, this is the first time in many years that the House of Friendship held a reception for such a distinguished Chinese guest. Veteran members of the Soviet-China Friendship Society came to meet with Li Peng. Also attending the meeting were veteran fighters who helped liberate China's northeast from the Japanese occupation; Soviet experts who, at the invitation of the Chinese Government, went to work in China in the 1950s; sinologists, activists from scientific, cultural, art circles; and Soviet youth representatives.

Tereshkova, chairman of the Presidium of the Union of Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries, delivered a welcome speech to the distinguished guest from China, his party, and to all people present at the gathering.

She said: Respectable Comrade Li Peng, premier of China's State Council, and respectable Chinese and Soviet comrades, friends, please allow me to extend to you a sincere welcome to the Moscow Home of Friendship in the name of the Union of Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries and the Soviet-China Friendship Society. The Soviet Union and China have achieved great progress in promoting an enduring and mutually beneficial cooperation, in cementing traditional friendship, and in neighborly relations. Relations between us have been developing smoothly in an all-round way. A great development in contacts between representatives of the Soviet and Chinese people has also been achieved in recent years. Tereshkova said that the Soviet people were watching with interest the achievements of the Chinese people in creating a powerful modern industry, promoting agricultural reform, and in enriching the spiritual culture of Chinese society. The Soviet people have been watching these achievements with friendly sentiment. The Soviet social circles hope that the Chinese leadership and people would solve problems smoothly in the course of advance, ensure the prosperity of the socialist motherland, and make China a developed and modern socialist country. The Soviet and Chinese people always harbor a deep sense of goodwill and mutual interest toward each other. Tereshkova said: (Misha), a famous and great writer of our country once wrote: I feel a certain link between China and Russia. Culturally and historically they share similarities. The activities of the Union of Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries and the Soviet-China Friendship Society precisely are for the noble cause of consolidating Soviet-Chinese friendship and mutual understanding.

Academician Tikhvinsky, chairman of the central board of the Soviet-China Friendship Society, spoke following Tereshkova's speech. He detailed the activities of the Soviet-China Friendship Society.

Chinese Premier Li Peng spoke.

[Li Peng heard speaking briefly in Russian fading into Mandarin translation by announcer] Comrades and friends, first of all, please allow me to send you warmest greeting in the name of the Chinese people and Government.

Then Li Peng said:

[Begin Li Peng recording] The warm speeches just delivered a few minutes ago by chairman of the Union of Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries and vice chairman [as heard] of the Soviet-China Friendship Society have greatly moved me. The Chinese people harbor a very friendly feeling toward the Soviet people. This kind of feeling not only shows in times of good relations between the two countries but also when the two countries experience difficulties in relations. This kind of friendship has always existed. Many Soviet friends present today are not only witnesses to these friendly relations, but are themselves contributors to such a friendship. This can be traced back to the time before the founding of the People's Republic of China and to the most difficult time for China when many Soviet comrades gave support to the Chinese revolution. [passage indistinct] If I remember correctly, [words indistinct] help design the first bridge on China's Yangtse River, the Wuhan Yangtse River Bridge. I think there are many who have contributed to Sino-Soviet friendship. Today it is a rare opportunity to gather here. [passage indistinct]

Last May, Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev made a historic visit to China. Thus, we ended the past and opened the future. Many actions can be taken in the course of cooperation between China and the Soviet Union. China and the Soviet Union share many identical views on cooperation. The two countries are now building socialism; we both want economic development and prosperity; we want our people [words indistinct]. We want peace and a peaceful environment. The two countries are now carrying out reforms. This kind of reform is designed to perfect the socialist system; it is not aimed at practicing capitalism. [passage indistinct]. Economically, we have different economic structures; we can complement each other. China possesses what the Soviet Union does not have; the Soviet Union possesses what China does not have. We greatly can expand cooperative relations in the economic sphere. I think the most important thing is to cherish the friendly sentiments between the Soviet and Chinese people. The old generation harbors friendly sentiments; we hope that these

kind of sentiments will be passed to the younger generation; it is hoped that the friendship between the two peoples will last generation after generation. China has implemented the policy of reform and opening to the outside world for 10 years. We have scored great victory in the last decade. Of course, there are some [word indistinct]. We unswervingly will implement the policy of reform and opening to the outside world.

Here, I would like to thank again the Union of Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries and the Soviet-China Friendship Society for providing us a place where we have had a pleasant time and talk with friends. I and my colleague [words indistinct] for a formal visit. We held fruitful talks with Comrade Ryzhkov. Today I met with Comrade Gorbachev. It is my belief that these talks and meeting will help contribute to strengthening friendship and cooperation between the two countries. The development of friendly relations between China and the Soviet Union will bring about great benefits to the world as well as to the Chinese and Soviet peoples. [end recording]

Shevardnadze, Li Peng Meet

LD2504194690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 25 Apr 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] At Li Peng's [video shows Qian Quichen] meeting with Foreign Minister Shevardnadze a wideranging dialogue took place on a number of issues of the relations between the USSR and the PRC and also of the present-day situation in the world.

From both sides readiness was emphasized for a further deepening of cooperation and mutual understanding in a spirit of the 18 May 1989 joint Soviet-Chinese communique.

Specific steps for the implementation of the agreement on strengthening confidence-building measures in the military sphere, which was signed in Moscow, were discussed.

The sides agreed to start in the near future the drawing up of specific parameters, components and deadlines for reducing troops in the area of the Soviet-Chinese border.

International problems were discussed with the emphasis on the need to ensure stability and security in the world. [video shows Shevardnadze and Qian Qichen seated next to each other and conversing]

Shevardnadze, Qian Qichen Talk

LD2504174790 Moscow TASS in English 1713 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 25 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and his visiting Chinese counterpart Qian Qichen met in Moscow today for a thorough discussion of bilateral issues and the world situation.

They stressed their common desire to broaden cooperation and improve mutual understanding in the spirit of the Soviet-Chinese communique of May 18, 1989.

Qian is accompanying Chinese Premier Li Peng, who has been in Moscow on an official visit since April 23.

During their meeting, Shevardnadze and Qian stressed the importance of stepping up contacts between the Foreign Ministries of the two countries, a goal served by a newly-signed protocol on consultations between the ministries.

Shevardnadze and Qian agreed that the ministries would regularly discuss underlying international problems and bilateral relations and explain their positions on international issues.

They repeated that it was expedient for the Soviet and Chinese foreign ministers to meet at least once a year.

Shevardnadze and Qian discussed specific steps to fulfill a just-signed agreement on basic principles for the mutual reduction of armed forces and military confidence-building measures along the Soviet-Chinese border. They agreed to launch practical talks to work out a schedule and other details for troop cuts there.

When discussing a frontier settlement, both parties noted agreement at respective talks on some 90 percent of the common border, and offered useful considerations on how to proceed with work regarding the frontier sections that have so far eluded agreement.

Both sides expressed resolve to continue the border talks and look for mutually acceptable solutions.

When discussing international problems, emphasis was made on the need to ensure stability and security amid sweeping changes in the world. The ministers took note of an emergent system of relations based on new political thinking and on ideas to create a new international political and economic order.

Shevardnadze stressed that relations with every country should be valued. It has taken a lot of effort to normalise Soviet-Chinese relations. "More than a quarter-century was lost in their development, which cost dearly the people of our countries and other socialist nations. The negative effects were felt not only in Asia, but elsewhere in the world," the Soviet foreign minister said.

"Something similar has happened in relations between the USSR and Albania. The rupture could have been avoided. We are not going to deny our share of responsibility for what happened. The latest statements by representatives of the Albanian leadership about readiness to restore diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union were not lost in Moscow.

"We can only welcome such statements and, for our part, are prepared to restore and develop friendly relations with Albania on the basis of complete equality, respect for sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity,

non-interference in each other's internal affairs, and mutual benefit," Shevardnadze said.

Shevardnadze briefed Qian on preparations for the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit. They paid much attention also to processes taking place in Europe, including major changes in Eastern Europe and the complex array of international issues connected with the prospect of a united Germany.

The discussion covered a wide range of issues related to the situation in Asia and the Pacific. Both parties called for measures to scale down military confrontation in the region and promote various forms of cooperation there.

The two ministers agreed that without a Korean settlement it would be impossible to achieve genuine security and stability in northeastern Asia and that dialogue between North and South Korea was key to defusing tension on the Korean peninsula.

Serious attention was given to the situation in Afghanistan, which is a neighbour of both the Soviet Union and China. The ministers specifically discussed ways to ensure peace and stability in that country.

They noted headway at negotiations on Cambodia, including increased understanding on various aspects of a settlement, and urged more vigorous efforts in this direction. The role the United Nations can play in the political resolution of related problems is becoming ever more clear. The latest statements by Cambodian head of government Hun Sen and Prince Norodom Sihanouk demonstrated the gradual rapprochement of their positions.

Shevardnadze welcomed upcoming contacts between Chinese and Vietnamese representatives, expressing confidence that an early normalisation of Chinese-Vietnamese relations would be very instrumental in achieving a healthier situation in Southeast Asia.

The ministers briefed each other on their contacts with parties involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict. They agreed that a balance of interests of direct participants in the conflict could be achieved only through political talks.

The meeting was friendly and businesslike.

Li Peng Holds News Conference

LD2504153190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1435 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 25 Apr (TASS)—Li Peng, premier of the PRC State Council, has described the results of his official visit to the Soviet Union as successful. Speaking at a news conference here today, he stressed that the aim of the visit was to "continue the opening up of the future" of Soviet-Chinese relations and to develop the process whose foundation was laid during last year's visit to China by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

In response to a question by a TASS correspondent about cooperation between the two countries in economics, trade, science, technology, and culture, the premier of the PRC State Council said that the visit opened new prospects for advancement in all of these directions. Speaking about specific forms of commerical and economic exchange, he said that the Soviet Union will grant credit to China for the construction of two nuclear electric power stations [AES's], each with a capacity of more than 2 million kw, and that the Chinese side will allocate credit to the Soviet Union amounting to more than 500 million Swiss francs for purchases of consumer goods.

Touching upon the accord between the USSR and the PRC concerning a reduction in military forces in the area of the Soviet-Chinese frontier, Li Peng stressed that a decrease in the level of military confrontation "would be very useful for both sides", and would contribute to an increase in mutual trust.

Concerning the changes in Eastern Europe, Li Peng said that these processes required additional study. "In any event", he stressed, "the PRC will maintain normal interstate relations with these countries on the basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence".

Speaking about China, the premier of the PRC State Council said that real successes had been attained in the process of implementing reforms and that this policy would remain unchanged. The political situation in the PRC was stable, he stressed.

Qian Qichen, PRC minister of foreign affairs, also participated in the news conference, and spoke about the content of his conversation with Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs. Qian Qichen reported that he had drawn the Soviet minister's attention to the concern of the Arab countries about the settlement of immigrants from the USSR in Arab territories occupied by Israel. According to the Chinese minister, Eduard Shevardnadze came out against such actions by Israel.

Speaking about the situation around Cambodia, Qian Qichen said that, in the opinion of both sides, the time has come to resolve this problem. In particular, he spoke in favor of implementing national reconciliation in Cambodia and of an active role for the United Nations in a settlement of the problem. Both sides expressed their readiness to maintain frequent consultations on this issue, the minister added.

Li Peng Visits Star City

LD2504222290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 25 Apr 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The prime minister of the PRC State Council today visited Star City. The Chinese delegation was warmly met by veterans of this educational center for the training of cosmonauts, which is unique in our country. The excursion through Star City and the inspection of

simulators and terrestrial copies of the "Salut" and "Mir" orbital stations were of interest. The guests spent some time in the hydrolaboratory where tests on contemporary spacecraft are conducted. On leaving, Li Peng left an entry in the book of honored visits. [video shows delegation in Star City including shots of spacecraft and underwater tests being observed]

Ryzhkov Joins Li Peng at Theater

LD2504205490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 25 Apr 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Li Peng and his wife visited the USSR Bolshoy theater in the evening. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov and his wife were with them in the theater's central box. The orchestra performed the national anthems of the two countries. The high-level Chinese guests watched the Swan Lake ballet of Peter Ilyich Tchaikovskiy.

Esteemed comrades, I wish to draw your attention to the fact that today you will be able to see in a television program an address by PRC Premier Li Peng, prepared for Soviet television. [video shows the Ryzhkovs and Li Peng and wife in the central box]

Li Peng Gives Speech on Moscow TV

LD2504203390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1755 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Television address by Li Peng, PRC State Council premier, on 25 April during his official visit to the USSR—recorded, in Mandarin with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] Good evening, comrades and friends! I am very glad to be visiting your country on an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government at a time when the first spring of the 1990's is arriving. Having stepped onto the land of your country my colleagues and I immediately perceived the deep feelings of friendship of the Soviet people for the Chinese people. Permit me, on behalf of the Chinese people, to convey cordial greetings and good wishes to the Soviet people.

As is known, the visit to China by Comrade Gorbachev last May and the meetings between the top leaders of the two countries led to the normalization of relations and opened up prospects for the establishment of relations of a new type between the PRC and the USSR.

During the past year, reciprocal ties and bilateral cooperation in various fields have received new development. The purpose of my present visit is indeed to move the process of the development of our bilateral relations further forward and to promote the uninterrupted deepening of the traditional friendship between our peoples.

During these three days, President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, Chairman Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov and other Soviet leaders and I have held a broad exchange of opinions on issues concerning the development of our bilateral relations and also on international problems of interest to both sides.

Our conversations were positive and fruitful. Both sides expressed satisfaction with the positive development and relations since the time they were normalized and adhere to the united opinion that China and the Soviet Union, complementing each other in the economy, are able to offer each other goods that are of interest to each other. An enormous potential is to be found in the field of expanding trade turnover and extremely favorable prospects exist for expanding technical and economic cooperation.

We need not only to strengthen cooperation in the traditional fields but to master new areas and new forms of cooperation. A number of documents on bilateral cooperation were signed yesterday. This not only bears witness to the fruitful results of deepening cooperation but also opens up promising opportunities for the further development of relations.

Our present visit has been a success. It is furthering the strengthening of the results of the Chinese-Soviet summit meeting, is promoting the deepening of mutual understanding between our countries and peoples, and is serving as new impetus for the further advancement of our mutual relations.

China and the Soviet Union are close neighbors and the friendship between our peoples has its roots in the distant past. Led by Lenin, the October Socialist Revolution of 1917 also pointed out the way to freedom and liberation to the Chinese people, which at that time was under a double yoke, that of imperialism and feudal autocracy. After the formation of the new China and traditional friendship between the Chinese and Soviet peoples received new development. Both during the years of the Chinese revolution and during the years of construction and Soviet people gave active support and help to the Chinese people.

The friendly feelings of our peoples toward each other were maintained in the depth of their hearts even during the years when our relations were in a state of anomaly. Yesterday, our delegation met activists of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society, amongst whom are many who in the past have worked in China. They continue not to strive for the cause of developing Chinese-Soviet friendship.

I would like once again to say to the Soviet people that the Government of China and the Chinese people attach great importance to their relations with the Soviet Union and have always held dear and do hold dear the traditional friendship with the Soviet people. We are willing to make efforts to develop further the tradition of mutual understanding, mutual support and mutual assistance between our peoples.

Now both China and the Soviet Union are carrying out reforms. It is quite natural that he peoples of our

countries should follow in a friendly and attentive way the progress of the reform and perestroyka and also the process of the development of each other's internal situations. We wish and we are confident that the Soviet people, who possess glorious revolutionary traditions, will certainly overcome the difficulties that face them and will build their country even better.

Over more than 40 years the Chinese people, under the CPC leadership and as a result of bitter, selfless struggle, have achieved the transformation of a semifeudal, semicolonial country into a country of socialism with original successes on the road of prosperity and might. We began implementing a policy of reform and openness at the end of the 1970's, and over the subsequent 10 years and more the appearance of our country has changed considerably. Our GNP and national income have more than doubled. We had difficulties, too, on the road of reform. Taking current issues into account, we have set our course toward improving the economic environment, imposing order in the economy, and deepening further the reform, and some extremely noteworthy successes have been achieved.

At the 6th Plenum of the 13th CPC Central Committee and at the 3d Session of the 7th National People's Congress an analysis was made and results were given in the matter of construction and reform in our country over the past decades. The whole of our people, thanks to this, recognized even better that only by means of uninterrupted deepening of the reform and defending its socialist direction will it be possible to fully realize the advantages of the socialist system and transform our homeland into a mighty, democratic, civilized country and a modern socialist state.

At the present time the Chinese people, under the leadership of the Communist Party, are struggling unanimously and with great enthusiasm to double the GNP in the 1990's.

In international affairs, China implements invariably an independent peaceful foreign policy and strives unswervingly for the preservation of peace throughout the world. We are in favor of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence becoming universal norms in international relations. China is willing to establish and develop friendly relations with all countries of the world upon the basis of these five principles. These norms have also been included in the joint Chinese-Soviet communique published in May of last year upon completion of the Chinese-Soviet summit meeting.

The sides consider that the development of good-neighborly and friendly relations between two great neighbors like China and the Soviet Union not only corresponds to the radical interests of the peoples of our countries, but also promotes the cause of peace in Asia and throughout the world.

Comrades! Friends! Concluding my address I would like to thank the Government of the Soviet Union and the Soviet people once again for the friendly reception that has been extended to us and to hope sincerely that the traditional friendship between the Chinese and Soviet peoples will receive further development. And from my heart I would also like to wish the Soviet people more and more new successes in socialist perestroyka and in the building of socialism.

Three-Day Moscow Visit Reviewed

LD2604055790 Moscow TASS in English 0549 GMT 26 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 26 TASS—The Chinese Premier Li Peng left Moscow for Leningrad today.

Li had a busy three-day stay in Moscow, including a talk with President Mikhail Gorbachev. The two men stressed that the Soviet Union's and China's dynamic development, just as the comprehensive good-neighbourly cooperation between them, meet the interests of all other countries and promote stability in the world.

Li met Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov. The sides called for broader cooperation between the peoples to help solve global economic, social and ecological problems. The negotiations, held in a friendly atmosphere and marked with goodwill, frankness and mutual understanding, were crowned with the signing of Sino-Soviet documents, including a long-term programme of development of economic, scientific and technological cooperation.

Li also met USSR Supreme Soviet President Anatoliy Lukyanov. The guest visited the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and laid a wreath there. A wreath was also laid at the Unknown Solider's Tomb at the Kremlin Wall.

The premier viewed the V.I. Lenin apartment-museum in the Kremlin and was greeted by Soviet cosmonauts in the Star City on the outskirts of Moscow.

Li Peng Leaves for Leningrad

LD2604081890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 26 Apr 90

[Text] On 26 April Li Peng, member of the Standing Committee of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and premier of the PRC State Council, left Moscow for Leningrad.

At Vnukovo Airport Li Peng and his wife were seen off by Nikolay Ivanovich and his wife; Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze; and other officials. The state flags of the PRC and the Soviet Union were raised at the airport. A guard of honor of the Moscow Garrison was drawn up. An orchestra played the state anthems of the two countries. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov and Li Peng inspected the formation of Soviet servicemen. The solemn seeing-off ceremony ended with a march-past by the guard of honor.

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev Receives Ambassadors' Credentials

LD2404174990 Moscow TASS in English 1725 GMT 24 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 24 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev received credentials from Ambassador of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea Son Song-pil and Cuban Ambassador Jose Ramon Balaguer in the Kremlin today.

The presentation of the credentials was followed by a conversation between Mikhail Gorbachev and the new ambassadors accredited under the new Soviet president.

The presentation ceremony was also attended by First Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Anatoliy Kovalev.

Soviet Chamber Head in Seoul Interviewed

SK2504022490 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 22 Apr 90

[Interview with Valeriy Nazarov, director of the Soviet Chamber of Commerce in Seoul by station commentator Vladimir Morozov; from the "Focus on Asia" program—date and place not given]

[Text] Although the Soviet Union and the ROK have not established diplomatic relations, it is believed that the recent development of the Soviet-ROK relations is beneficial to both sides. It is also believed that it will contribute to the cause of solidifying peace and security on the Korean peninsula. The trade, scientific, and cultural exchanges between our two countries are increasing these days. This is especially true in trade relations. The largest part of ROK exports are consumer goods, such as clothing, household appliances, and computers, and the Soviet Union is still paying for them with raw materials. However, other forms of working cooperation have already begun to operate.

Soviet ships are being repaired at shipyards in the ROK. A direct air route has been opened between Moscow and Seoul. The ROK companies are [words indistinct]. ROK businesses are looking forward to the realization of joint venture businesses in Siberia and the Soviet Far East. The ROK's Korean Trade Promotion Corporation [Kotra] has its permanent mission stationed in Moscow. Kotra in Moscow is equipped with a Consular Department as well. Corresponding to this, the USSR Chamber of Commerce office in Seoul is conducting business in the ROK. The [word indistinct] of this office is also similar.

Valeriy Nazarov, director of the Soviet Chamber of Commerce in Seoul, answers questions posed by the station commentator Vladimir Morozov as follows.

[Vladimir Morozov question read by announcer] Are you satisfied with the present economic relations?

[Nazarov heard speaking in Russian fading into Korean translation by announcer] As far as trade is concerned, I am satisfied with the growth of the mutual exchange of goods. The trade value last year between the two countries amounted to about 600 million U.S. dollars, which is a significant increase when compared with the ($200) million the year before last. We anticipate that the trade value will amount to about $1 billion in 1990. The fate of our relations depends upon how the [word indistinct] long-term cooperation will be made and how much we will be able to push ahead with joint venture [word indistinct] and complete cooperation. Of course the expansion of traditional imports and exports through customs is important. But more important is, I think, that our geographically neighboring countries form the economic structure in which both sides compensate each other. As experience shows, the traditional exchange of goods that begins at [word indistinct] can grow very rapidly. However, this development can come against a slump. If we fail to set up a long-term plan related to the founding of joint venture enterprises before we come up against such a slump, we may experience bitter disappointment.

[Morozov question read by announcer] Do you think that it is necessary for the two countries to establish diplomatic relations to push ahead with economic cooperation, as is often mentioned by ROK politicians and businessmen?

[Nazarov heard speaking in Russian fading into Korean translation by announcer] The establishment of diplomatic relations itself can facilitate the exchanges in the economic and cultural fields. However, I do not think that the establishment of diplomatic relations is followed immediately by a sudden change in the situation. The two sides ought to understand this well, and each side should be faithful to its responsibility. To achieve this, the establishment of diplomatic relations—an important event—by itself will not be enough. Nevertheless, it will be a definite advantage. However, in order to enrich it realistically, it becomes important how the enterprises of the Soviet Union and the ROK will work together and how swiftly they will be able to realize a climate of mutual trust.

[Morozov question read by announcer] How are the Soviet businessmen treated in the ROK? What are the difficult problems encountered and how are they solved?

[Nazarov heard speaking in Russian fading into Korean translation by announcer] They are treated, as a whole, with goodwill and with a friendly attitude. Not only business and science circles but also ordinary people openly show their friendly feelings to us in the street. If there were no problems at all, it would be unusual. We have had very little opportunity to know each other, nor do we know each other's economic [word indistinct]. It is not easy to find a common (?language). There is still a problem if you want to see every corner of the country. The reporters, businessmen, and scientific and cultural activists who come to this country at the invitation of the

ROK side are not aware of this problem. Those who want to conduct business permanently stationed here should undergo certain procedures required by regulations. For instance, if I want to leave for a certain city, I have to fo through certain procedures. I have to receive written confirmation. In other words, I have to file an application 72 hours in advance, designate the license number of the car in which I will ride, and inform the authorities beforehand in which hotel I am going to stay. However, it seems that this procedure is being simplified gradually. I believe that all the difficult problems will disappear with the improvement of our relations.

U.S. Peninsula Presence Adds to DPRK 'Fears'

PM2504133590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 apr 90 First Edition p 3

[A. Matveyev article: "Protecting Native Soil: Today Is Korean People's Army Day"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Korea and its people are still artificially divided. More than 40,000 U.S. servicemen, equipped with the very latest—including nuclear—weapons, remain stationed in the south of the peninsula. On the pretext of preparing "to guard against aggression from the north," they join with the 600,000-strong Seoul army in holding extensive military maneuvers which arouse understandable fears in the DPRK.

However, Washington and Seoul are in no hurry to discuss Pyongyang's constructive proposals on lowering the level of military confrontation on the peninsula.

That is why the life of the Korean People's Army, prepared at any moment to oppose the threat to the DPRK's security, remains tense today. On Korean People's Army Day Soviet soldiers wish its servicemen success as they stand guard over the DPRK's borders.

Vegetables, Fruit Exported to Soviet Union

SK2404132190 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 12 Apr 90

[Talk on Meeting between Representatives of Primorskiy Kray Fishery Consumers' Cooperative and DPRK fruit trading company from the "Introduction to Primorskiy Kray" Program]

[Text] Not long ago, a meeting between representatives from the the Primorskiy Kray Fishery Consumers' Cooperative and the DPRK fruit trading company was held in Vladivostok.

[Begin (Leonid Doborososkiy) recording in Russian fading into Korean translation read by announcer] (Leonid Doborososkiy), vice chairman of the Primorskiy Kray Fishery Consumers' Cooperative, says: The DPRK fruit trading company provided us with vegetables and fruit valued at 2.5 million rubles in 1989. The supply of vegetables and fruit will incease to 15 million tons in 1990.

This cooperation is very helpful to us because our basic task is to pack foodstuffs and other goods and to send them to our seamen working on the sea and to provide them with welfare services. We have also received vegetables and fruit from Uzbekistan, Kirgizia, Ukrainian Republics. However, after being transported by railway for several thousand kilometers, these vegetables and fruit received from these regions cannot be properly preserved. Therefore, it is difficult to transport them to sea, and seamen, too, do not want to receive such vegetables and fruit. This is why we have sold them on the continent.

Our seamen's demands for Korean fruit are very high. In the meeting this time, we discussed with representatives from the DPRK fruit trading company the problem of directly loading fruit on Soviet ships at Korean sea ports so that fruit can be transported to our fishing operation zones. It has been agreed that the DPRK fruit trading company pay the expenses needed in loading fruit onto ships.

Because of the warm weather in Korea, Korean farmers have enjoyed an abundant harvest in vegetables and fruits earlier than Soviet farmers. In return for receiving these highly nutritious foodstuffs we have provided mineral materials, (?fertilizer), and fish to Korea.

Comrade Yi Sok-ki, president of the DPRK fruit trading company, which has been engaged in trade business with the Soviet side for the past year, said that the future prospects of the cooperation between the two sides are very good and continued:

[Begin Yi Sok-ki recording] The cooperative trade business between us and the Primorskiy Kray of the Soviet Union is totally in thanks to the intimate relations between Comrade Kim Il-song, our great leader, and Comrade Gorbachev, president of the Soviet Union. I firmly believe that this will be strengthened and developed by mutual understanding and friendship between the people of the two countries. Also, I think that all of the trading relations between us have been achieved on the strength of the development of active and friendly relations between the people of the two countries. I firmly believe that remarkable progress will be made in the trading relations between our two cooperative organs. At the same time, I will make active efforts to strengthen and develop friendship and solidarity between the Korean and Soviet people. In particular, I take this opportunity to sincerely wish the Soviet people great success. [end recording]

Last year fishermen in Primorskiy Kray received 2,500 tons of peaches, apricots, [word indistinct], tomatoes, and cucumbers from the DPRK fruit trading company. The Primorskiy Kray Fishery Consumers' Cooperative hopes to receive from Korea all kinds of vegetables and fruits except for potatos and other late-season vegetables.

(Doborososkiy), chairman of the Primorskiy Kray Fishery Consumers' Cooperative, said: We have maintained cooperation with a Vietnamese company, a

Korean company, Thai companies, and some Chinese companies. We have invested 30 percent of [word indistinct] in purchasing the facilities necessary for producing sausages, ice cream, and dumplings. Big fishing bases and other enterprises in Promorskiy Kray have purchased these facilities. We have also been greatly interested in purchasing processed livestock foodstuffs. International cooperation promotes experiences in our business and improves the quality of our goods.

Japanese Defense Plans Arouse Regional Anxiety

LD2304183590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1219 GMT 23 Apr 90

[By TASS political observer Askold Biryukov]

[Text] Moscow, 23 April (TASS)—Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu today indicated in the Japanese parliament that, despite the positive tendencies toward detente in East-West relations, Japan will continue the growth of its military preparations.

Even in conditions of changes in the international situation, he said at the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives, we must remain devoted to our concept of "defense, oriented exclusively on protection" of the country. He also spoke approvingly about his government's efforts which are directed, as he expressed it, at the achievment of a "moderate defense potential," sufficient to repulse a potential "limited act of aggression." Yozo Ishikawa, head of Japan's national defense administration, who developed the thesis of the so-called "Soviet threat," supported the premier.

In the world today, and even in Japan itself, you will not find many people who would continue to credit the existence of the mythical "Soviet threat." The references made periodically to this "threat" by Japanese official figures are the more surprising for that. The question arises involuntarily: Why are they in Tokyo continuing to brandish the bugbear of the "Soviet threat" under conditions of changes for the better happening throughout the world and against a background of the practical steps which are being undertaken by the Soviet Union with a view to reducing tension and to strengthening confidence in the Asia-Pacific Region?

The whole point is that despite calls from opposition parties for a revision of previous plans for building the Japanese Armed Forces in light of changes in the international arena and for a freeze on military expenditure, the Japanese Government not only has no intention of doing so, but is fully determined not to alter plans for modernization and strengthening of the military might of the country's armed forces. This is evidenced not only by the statements of the prime minister and the head of the military department, but also by the next five-year program for development of the armed forces for 1991-95 presently being worked out, implementation of which will require an astronomical sum of 23,000,000 million [as received] yen.

Meanwhile, the steadfast increase in the military might of the Japanese Armed Forces, which are already today among the most combat capable in the world, is beginning to arouse anxiety not only among Japan's neighbors, and particularly those who have already had experience in the past of what Japanese militarism means. This fact is not even to the joy of the Pentagon figures, who even yesterday were championing the stepping up of Japanese military might. Today, as if by some agreement, they are speaking in favor of its restriction and against allowing Japan to turn into one of the world's major military powers, and one of the U.S. generals has even advocated keeping U.S. Armed Forces on Japan's territory for the next ten years in order to... hinder the resurgence of Japanese military might and, as he put it, to act as the role of "the cork stopping the bottle."

We will not hazard any guess as to what is behind these statements and ideas expressed by the U.S. military. It is another thing which is important. What is evident is the anxiety of a whole range of states and peoples of the Asia-Pacific region over the development of military preparations in Japan. It would be rash, to say the least, for official Tokyo to ignore this circumstance.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Rogachev Views USSR-Pacific Rim Relations

WA2504191690 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 20 Apr 90 p 3

[Report on interview with I.A. Rogachev, deputy USSR foreign minister, by A. Kiselev; date and place not specified: "Compass of Partnership in the Pacific"]

[Text] The subject of our interview has behind him 32 years of diplomatic service, which began following his graduation in 1955 from the Moscow State International Relations Institute—the forge of Foreign Ministry personnel. I.A. Rogachev worked in the Soviet embassies in Beijing and Washington, where he really had to deal with issues pertaining to the sphere of high policy. His experience served him in good stead subsequently in the ministry's central machinery following his appointment initially as head of the Southeast Asia and First Far East desks, and then as chief of the Asian Socialist Countries Administration. A thorough restructuring began with E.A. Shevardnadze's arrival in the Foreign Ministry. The new minister emphasized the promotion of diplomats who thought expansively and in non-standard fashion and who had had real professional training. They included I.A. Rogachev, who in August 1986 came to occupy the position of deputy minister.

[Kiselev] Igor Alekseyevich, you dealt for many years with problems of the Asia-Pacific region. Can it be said today that Soviet diplomacy has finally "turned to face" the Asia-Pacific region?

[Rogachev] I began handling these problems in my present position 10 days after M.S. Gorbachev spoke in

Vladivostok on 28 July 1986, setting forth the comprehensive program of our policy in the region. Three main tasks were formulated at that time: the normalization of bilateral relations with states of the Asia-Pacific region, a search for ways to settle the regional conflicts there and a lessening of the military standoff in Pacific Asia. In the almost four years which have elapsed the Soviet Union has improved, restored, and established from scratch relations with the vast majority of countries of the region. As you know, the USSR has totally withdrawn its forces from Afghanistan and is now making as big a contribution as possible to the peaceful solution of the Afghan problem. Much has been done for a sign of light at the end of the tunnel on a Cambodian settlement.

The process of military detente in the region continues. In accordance with plans which have been announced, a cutback in Soviet Armed Forces in the Far East is under way. An agreement has been signed on the complete withdrawal of Soviet forces from Mongolia. A start has been made on measures to reduce our military presence in Vietnam.

It is another matter that we cannot be satisfied by the fact that it has not yet proven possible to create a mechanism for discussion between leading states of the region of the most important problems of the security of the Asia-Pacific region, such as have been in operation in Europe for 30 years now.

[Kiselev] Many people in our country are disturbed by the state of Soviet-Japanese relations. The justified opinion, in our view, that a stimulation of trade and economic relations with Japan could be a considerable help in the business of restructuring our economy, in Siberia and the Far East particularly, is being expressed. What, in your view, is the principal restraining factor to the development of relations with Japan?

[Rogachev] I cannot say that Soviet-Japanese relations are at a standstill. There have been changes for the better here also. Political dialogue has become constant, and last year our two countries' foreign ministers met four times, which was not the case previously. Interparliamentary ties were stepped up, and the establishment of contacts between the CPSU and Japan's ruling Liberal-Democratic Party was a fundamentally new feature.

As a result of E.A. Shevardnadze's visit to Tokyo at the end of 1988 an agreement was reached on starting negotiations on the preparation of a peace treaty between the USSR and Japan. Almost 45 years have elapsed since World War II ended, and the absence of a peace treaty between our countries is undoubtedly an anomaly.

But I have to mention the difficulties also. The orientation of official Tokyo circles toward the nonseparation of politics and economics seems to us irrational. It conceals an approach in accordance with which there can be no speaking of full-fledged and full-scale cooperation in all spheres without a settlement of the so-called "territorial problems" in our relations and without the Soviet Union's return of four islands of the South Kuriles chain. But, after all, if an attempt is made to reduce the entire intricate set of relations between the two countries to the discussion of a single issue and make our relations "hostage" to the so-called "territorial problem," we will not, of course, get very far.

Last September the USSR and Japanese foreign ministers formulated in New York a kind of timetable of political contacts between Moscow and Tokyo. Its ultimate goal is the visit of the top leader of the Soviet Union to Japan. It is scheduled approximately for 1991. There has never been such a visit in the history of our relations.

[Kiselev] If I have understood you correctly, even if the differences between our countries on the question of the "northern territories" persists, this will not be an obstacle to the top-level visit?

[Rogachev] Quite right.

[Kiselev] Last May, following M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Beijing, an appreciable improvement in Soviet-Chinese relations was observed. What kind of situation is taking shape in our contacts with China today?

[Rogachev] The normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations is undoubtedly a very important achievement in our Asia-Pacific policy. Both parties are confirming and proving in practice fidelity to the basic principles contained in the joint statement on the results of the visit last May. Strenuous work has been performed since that time to prepare the ground for important new steps in the development of cooperation between the two states, parties, and peoples. A process of the mutual study of experience is under way. We have things to learn from one another.

[Kiselev] Igor Alekseyevich, the view is being expressed in the Western press currently that the contradictions between the communist parties of our two countries in the ideological sphere persist.

[Rogachev] There could be no situation where we would have no disagreements even with the closest countries and neighbors. We do not, however, intend to carry over the persisting disagreements into our interstate relations.

Of course the biggest event of this year in Soviet-Chinese relations will be the visit to the USSR of Li Peng, premier of the PRC State Council, which will begin in a few days time. Top-level negotiations will take place. It is planned to sign a whole number of new agreements between the two countries, which, in my view, will considerably strengthen the legal basis of Soviet-Chinese relations.

In respect of the results of the year which has elapsed since M.S. Gorbachev's visit to China I would like to mention particularly the negotiations on the question of a reduction in armed forces and confidence-building measures in the military sphere in the Soviet- Chinese border area. The significance of these negotiations goes

far beyond the framework of bilateral relations. We very much hope that they will be the forerunner of multilateral negotiations on a reduction in the military confrontation in the Asia-Pacific region as a whole.

[Kiselev] Considerable potential is contained in the Soviet Union's development of trade and economic relations with the capitalist states of Southeast Asia and Oceania. What tasks confront Soviet diplomacy in relations with this group of countries?

[Rogachev] We have noticed a decisive change for the better in relations with countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) which unites Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, the Philippines and Brunei. We are currently developing relations successfully both with ASEAN as an organization and with each participant in this group, with the exception of Brunei, with which we do not as yet have diplomatic relations. A whole number of Southeast Asian countries has surged ahead in the development of industry and science and technology and in the production of science-intensive products, and there are good opportunities for the establishment of fruitful cooperation with them. This is indicated by the results of N.I. Ryzhkov's recent visit to Thailand, Australia, and Singapore, in the course of which 10 intergovernmental agreements were signed. The task is to transfer this cooperation to the sphere of actual deeds as quickly as possible. After all, the Asia-Pacific region countries as yet account for only six percent of the Soviet Union's total foreign trade.

I would like particularly to emphasize the following principle: In successfully developing relations with this group of countries we do not in the least wish to upset the system of international relations which has already taken shape in this region and have no desire to damage the relations of the Asia-Pacific region states with such major powers as the United States and Japan. Although some people are not averse to accusing us of this.

As far as South Korea is concerned, we have established trade and economic relations with this country. I believe that not noticing South Korea and ignoring it is simply irrational. If we want the Soviet Union to become integrated in the system of the international division of labor in the Far East, it should undoubtedly develop trade and economic relations with Seoul.

[Kiselev] Igor Alekseyevich, one has the impression from talking with you that those who speak of a gradual shift of the center of world politics from the Atlantic area to the Pacific zone are not that wrong, perhaps?

[Rogachev] Yes, I am familiar with such theories. However, I believe that the "pyramid" will hardly become inverted and that the center of international relations, which is currently in the Atlantic zone, will suddenly shift to the Pacific. I believe that we may rather speak of a leveling of the rate of development and growth of interdependence between regions of the world. I believe that in parallel with this leveling there will be at the macrolevel an equalization in the levels of development of individual areas of the Soviet Union, when we finally "pull up" our Far East areas to the level of the European part of the USSR. In any event, this is a perfectly realistic task and is the prospect which is emerging toward the start of the third millennium.

Thai Deputy Premier's USSR Visit Reported

BK2104100590 Moscow in Thai to Thailand 1100 GMT 20 Apr 90

[Text] On 19 April Thai Deputy Prime Minister Phong Sarasin concluded his official visit to the Soviet Union. His schedule was a busy one. He said:

[Begin Phong recording] The main aim of my visit is to bring Thai private sector leaders and senior officials to study the economic and political changes in East Europe and the Soviet Union. The other aim is to explore greater Thai-Soviet investment and trade. [end recording]

On this basis, the Thai deputy prime minister held talks with Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Stephan Sitaryan; [name indistinct], president of the Soviet Government Commission on Food and Material Procurement; Konstantin Katushev, minister of foreign economic relations; and Kondrat Terekh, minister of trade. The Thai delegation also met the president of the Soviet Chamber of Commerce and visited the Fish Industry Ministry.

On 19 April, the last day of the visit, Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov received the Thai delegation at the Kremlin.

The visit is the first positive step in the expansion of economic relations and cooperation between Thailand and the Soviet Union. Mr. Phong expressed Thai interest in buying steel, newsprint, and scrap metal and noted their readiness in selling products such as shoes, leather goods, children clothes, home electric appliances, toys, medicine, canned fruits, canned marine products, rice, sugar, and tapioca. Mr. Phong said Thailand could sell rice to the Soviet Union at an attractive price and at favorable credit terms.

An agreement was signed for Thai firms to join the consumer product fair, [name of fair indistinct], in Moscow. Several Thai businesses in food processing, rubber, textile, and seafood industries will also soon visit the Soviet Union to study trade possibilities. They are expected to visit the Ukraine, Belorussia, Kazakh, Uzbek, Moldavia, Siberia and the Soviet Far East. It is anticipated that they will have the opportunity to study the possibility of direct contacts with Soviet industrial and agricultural circles.

Deputy Prime Minister Phong said overall, he was pleased with the outcome of the visit to the Soviet Union.

Rogachev Meets New Zealand National Party Head

LD1904203890 Moscow TASS in English 1918 GMT 19 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 19 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev today received visiting leader of New Zealand National Party James Bolger today.

The participants in the meeting favoured broader Soviet-New Zealand relations and contacts both on the governmental level and between political parties, organisations and individuals.

The state of affairs in the Asia-Pacific region, including military-political and trade-economic aspects, was also discussed.

Nishanov Receives Bolger

PM2304090590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Opinions Exchanged"]

[Text] On 20 April R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, met with J. Bolger, leader of the New Zealand National Party and leader of the parliamentary opposition.

J. McArthur, New Zealand ambassador to the USSR, was present at the talks.

Seminar on Perestroyka, Southeast Asia Held

LD2504131990 Moscow TASS in English 1216 GMT 25 Apr 90

[By TASS correspondent Boris Chekhonin]

[Text] Bangkok April 25 TASS—The policy of perestroyka pursued by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev has drastically changed the international situation in Southeast Asia. It set the stage for eliminating the threat of war from the area and enabled peoples to concentrate on their economic development, according to participants in a round-table discussion organised by the Japanese YOMIURI newspaper in Bangkok.

"Historic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe prompted positive development in Southeast Asia," Japanese Ambassador to Thailand Hisahito Okazaki, said.

"The Soviet threat is disappearing. International relations in the region are changing. Southeast Asian countries now have a good opportunity to achieve economic progress," he said.

Scientists taking part in the seminar said that perestroyka will have an impact on forthcoming changes in China, Vietnam and North Korea. These changes will not be as sweeping as in Europe, they said.

Suthichai Yoon, editor in chief of the authoritative NATION Thai newspaper supported creating a new concept of international security in the region.

The United States, Japan, ASEAN countries, and Soviet Union, China and Vietnam should take part in preparing it, he said.

Near East & South Asia

Afghan General Appraises Assistance From USSR

LD2504133190 Moscow TASS in English 1316 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] Kabul April 25 TASS—"Over the twelve years that have passed since the April Revolution, the Afghan Armed Forces have traversed a long way of successful development," Colonel-General M. Mangal, head of the Main Political Administration of the Afghan Army, told TASS.

"They now meet the highest requirements and possess up-to-date powerful and effective weapons to combat the enemy that has been armed to the teeth by Pakistani and U.S. supporters.

"It will be no exaggeration to say that the Afghan Army which has a wide experience in combat operations is now capable of defending the country's sovereignty and independence against any enemy," Mangal said.

He praised assistance which the Soviet Union has rendered to Afghanistan. "It continues to give assistance to us in most diverse forms up to this date, for which we are deeply grateful to our northern neighbour, Mangal emphasised.

The Afghan military leader described the national reconciliation policy as the Afghan leadership's major and basic initiative.

"Although a lot of ordeals are still in store for us, I regard further development of the situation in the country with optimism," he said.

"I am confident that the people will follow those who bring peace, and not extremists that count on a continuation of the war in the name of their selfish goals," Mangal said.

Restrictions Lifted on Soviets Hajj Participants

LD2404172590 Tehran IRNA in English 1658 GMT 24 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, April, 24, IRNA—Soviet Moslems will have a better chance to participate at annual hajj pilgrimage in the holy city of Mecca in Saudia Arabia.

In the past the number of Soviet Moslem pilgrims were limited to less than 50 due to restrictions imposed by Moscow. The number is expected to increase substantially this year although it is still far from reaching the

expectations of the Soviet Moslem population which now stands at more than 80 million.

Anatoliy Dubkov an official at the Soviet Council of Religion in Moscow told IRNA that the Soviet Government has provided the council with four charter planes to facilitate the travel of Soviet Moslems to Mecca for the upcoming hajj pilgrimage.

The council has the task of coordinating works for the registration and travel of Soviet pilgrims to Mecca.

According to Dubkov pilgrims will be flown to Mecca from central cities of the four republics of Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation.

Meanwhile Vadim Perfiliyev a spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry said today that the process of obtaining Saudi visas for the Soviet pilgrims will be worked out with the Riyadh government on the basis of international regulations.

The two countries although enjoying diplomatic relations lack embassies in one another's capitals.

Soviet Jews Debate Issues With PLO Envoys

PM2604083190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 5

[A. Ostalskiy article: "From Different Standpoints Without Enmity: PLO Dialogue With Representatives of the Jewish Intelligentsia"]

[Text] They remained apart, eyeing one one another warily, not attempting to communicate either by looks or smiles. And although they were sitting around the same table it was immediately evident where the boundary between the two groups lay. That was all quite natural—"breaking the ice" requires them to get to know each other and hold constant dialogue. Today, however, was merely the first meeting, the first meeting ever between a PLO delegation and representatives of the Soviet Jewish intelligentsia.

The PLO delegation at this meeting, held at the USSR Academy of Sciences Oriental Studies Institute on 19 April, was headed by Abu-Mazin, an authoritative leader of the PLO and a member of that organization's Executive Committee. The other side had no leader—each of the participants represented either himself alone or organizations such as the Moscow Jewish Cultural and Educational Society or the Jewish History Society. The first attempts to "achieve a breakthrough in mutual understanding" (to use the writer Alla Gerber's expression) were not easy. The most trenchant disputes developed around two topics—Zionism and Jewish emigration from the USSR: Here a rapprochement of positions is still a long way off. Here are a few extracts from this long and difficult discussion of around 5 hours' duration.

Abu-Mazin: As distinct from West Europe, the "Jewish question" simply did not exist in the Near East. There was no social or religious struggle at all. The Arab, Muslim world knew no such phenomenon as the pogrom. The struggle began only as a consequence of the emergence of Zionism—a movement which aimed to create a Jewish state in Palestine under the slogan "A land without people for a people without a land." In actual fact, of course, that land was in no way empty—it was inhabited by the Palestinians.

Mark Batunskiy (senior scientific assistant at the USSR Academy of Sciences Sociology Institute): Many people to this day curse Anwar al-Sadat, the late Egyptian President. But I am sure that he will go down in world history as the man who first started a peace dialogue with Israel. That same heroic deed is being accomplished today by the Palestinians and those Israelis who sit down at the negotiating table despite the threats of reprisal made against them and others for doing so. As far as Israel is concerned, it is, of course, necessary to banish "orientophobia," that contempt for the Arabs. I am sure that Israel and a future peaceful Palestinian state will become the most advanced forces in the Near East. In close economic cooperation with each other they could become the driving force which raises to a new level an entire region which at present, unfortunately, lag behind world development. As for the Palestinians, they need to get rid of all the destructive influences and be governed solely by the Palestinian people's national interests, and nothing else.

Nabil 'Amr (ambassador of the State of Palestine to the USSR): The Palestinians reject anti-Semitism and consider it inimical to themselves both morally and politically. Moreover, we condemn all manifestations of terrorism. Many of our leaders have died at the hands of terrorists. Terrorism merely leads to impasse. Dialogue and mutual understanding alone constitute our path.

Tankred Galenpolskiy (chief editor of the magazine VESTNIK YEVREYSKOY KULTURY): First and foremost I wholeheartedly want the Palestinian people to acquire their own land and live in it in peace. I was greatly pleased by the statement I heard today from an official Palestinian representative that the Palestinians dissociate themselves from anti-Semitism as well as terrorism. But work has to be done today on the image the PLO has in the eyes of public opinion, to ensure that the PLO grasps the difference between the threats still issuing from the mouths of some Arabs and your present position. And I want to make clear why talk about Zionism makes Soviet Jews wary. Zionism is an ideology which you can share or not. It is a kind of "Jewish dream" of returning to the land which some, rightly or wrongly, consider to be their historical homeland. Zionism as an ideology bears no responsibility for the practice of a particular Israeli Government, just as Marxism bears no responsibility for, say, the introduction of Soviet troops into Afghanistan. In our situation, however, in conditions of rampant anti-Semitism, the word "Zionist" has come to signify something quite different. It has become simply a synonym of the abusive term "yid."

Abu-Mazin: When we talk about Zionism we mean those who insist on prolonging the occupation of our lands and the forcible eviction of Arabs from their own homes. If the Zionist movement were not so aggressive, were not so hostile to us, we would have nothing against it. Of course, organizations and parties do now exist in Israel whose Zionist bona fides cannot be doubted but which have learned from practical experience the necessity of liberating the territories occupied in 1967 and giving the Palestinians self-determination. We are building relations with those Zionists and will develop dialogue with them.

Yosif Lakhman (deputy chairman of the Moscow Jewish Cultural and Educational Society): I do not have a single acquaintance who regards the Palestinians with disrespect. We all want sincere dialogue, we all want peace rather than bloodshed. But if we want to assist dialogue we must, it seems to me, eschew the blanket censure of Zionism. Like any ideology, it can be criticized, but one cannot deny that it does reflects people's feelings and aspirations. It would be worthwhile perhaps for the Palestinians to advise the Soviet leadership to close down the ignominious anti-Zionist committee and stop financing its activity at taxpayers' expense. Consider the fact that we have no other organization with the prefix "anti"—no antifascist or anti-Pol Pot bodies. Only anti-Zionist. Why?

Marwan Kanafani (PLO political advisor): Zionism for us means a movement that suppresses our freedoms and has seized our land. The Zionism we know is armed Zionism. I do not think that the movement's ideology can be separated from its practice. And I do not understand why the Palestinian people should suffer so cruelly because people give the word "Zionist" the wrong meaning somewhere.

Taysir 'Aruri (professor at Bir Zayt University on the West Bank): As someone who spent 5 years in an Israeli prison without trial or investigation, I find it strange listening to the attempts made here to justify Zionism. After all, one can judge an ideology only by its practical application. We have seen for ourselves during the almost 100 years of Zionism's existence that its essence is an attempt to resolve the Jewish problem at the Palestinian people's expense. Although, of course, Zionists have now emerged who advocate the creation of a Palestinian state and are opposed to tyranny. We can cooperate with them.

Abu-Mazin: The main topic in the Near East today is the problem of Soviet emigration to Israel. This phenomenon worries us so because it could undermine the entire peace process in the region. After all, it was not without reason that Yitzhaq Shamir stated that "A greater Israel is needed for large-scale emigration." You know that there exists a map of Israel occupying Jordanian and Lebanese territory, part of Syria, and the Sinai Peninsula... When I hear about that map, how am I to regard Jewish emigration? Of course, we cannot object to the freedom to emigrate from the USSR—that is your soverign choice. But we favor full freedom. We are against people being forced into a particular place. After all, previously 90 percent of Jews preferred to go to other countries, while now only the road to Israel is open to them.

T. Galenpolskiy: Soviet Jews leaving the USSR today are indeed forced to go only to Israel, the sole country which accepts them without restriction. But the voices heard in the Arab world demanding that emigration be banned because of this are distressing. We are talking about people's future here, after all. And Soviet Jews do not go to Israel at all because they hate the Palestinians. That is why direct dialogue is essential. And another thing—we would ask you in your meetings with the Soviet leaders to register your concern not only at the fact that the Jews leaving the USSR could turn up rifle in hand in Palestine, but at the fact that no one in the Soviet leadership hauls the anti-Semites over the coals.

A. Gerber: No one must be deprived of the right to live where he wishes. Neither Palestinian nor Jew. As far as the reasons for the departure of Jews from the USSR are concerned, the need to remove the causes for that exodus are our common problem. We have clearly and explicitly asked the country's leadership and M.S. Gorbachev to publicly say: Do not leave, we need you, we will protect you from the anti-Semites. But the leaders do not for some reason or other want to make such a statement...

N. 'Amr: The mass emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel cannot be regarded as a purely humanitarian problem. It does have other dimensions. The emigrant arriving in Israel is forced to become an occupier, a settler in the occupied territories, and he becomes willy-nilly a tool in the hands of Shamir's strategists. For a Palestinian the Israeli soldier firing at him represents not a member of the Soviet Jewish intelligentsia but a practical embodiment of Zionism.

M. Kanafani: The link between emigration and the expansion of Israel is obvious. That is why the question of growing Soviet emigration is for us a matter of life and death. Shamir's political game and objectives have nothing at all to do with the humanitarian problem of Soviet Jews' freedom to leave.

M. Batunskiy: The problem of emigration is a dreadful one. It is, after all, a tragedy for both the emigrants themselves and Gorbachev, since those leaving include many earnest supporters of perestroyka. It is tragedy for the Near East, too.

Zalman Levin (leading scientific staffer at the USSR Academy of Sciences Oriental Studies Institute): Emigration will increase, and no outside interference will help here. What is the solution, then? I am convinced that there is only one solution, and that is the earliest possible peaceful settlement of the Near East problem as a whole. This is an urgent necessity. The Palestinian side has shown that it is sincerely seeking peace and that it has already taken a large step. Palestinians and Jews should coexist...

Egyptian Proposal for Weapons Pact Noted

PM2004155990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Apr 90 Second Edition p 6

[Dispatch by own correspondent V. Belyakov: "Egypt's Peace Initiative: In the Interests of Detente in the Near East"]

[Text] Cairo, 19 Apr—Egyptian Foreign Minister 'I. 'Abd-al-Majid has sent a letter to UN Secretary General J. Perez de Cuellar in which he suggested examining the question of turning the Near East into a zone free from mass destruction weapons.

This idea, which Egyptian President H. Mubarak advanced last week, appears in the letter in the form of a political initiative. According to it, all Near Eastern states that possess any of the types of mass destruction weapons—nuclear, chemical, or biological—must eliminate them, while those that do not have them must pledge not to seek to possess such weapons.

The problem of mass destruction weapons has come to the forefront of Near Eastern politics in recent weeks after Western countries accused Iraq of attempting to illegally acquire from the United States components to produce a nuclear bomb. The campaign mounted by them has also been joined by Israel, whose high-ranking figures have threatened to make a military strike against Iraqi targets. This has been taken very seriously in Baghdad. People there remember well June 1981, when Israeli bombers destroyed the Iraqi nuclear research center where, so Tel Aviv claimed, work was being conducted on atomic weapons.

Iraqi President S. Husayn has declared in response to the Israeli threats that if Israel inflicts a nuclear strike on his country, then counteractions involving the use of chemical weapons will destroy half of Israel. Iraqi Foreign Minister T. 'Aziz has pointed in turn to his country's readiness to eliminate chemical weapons on condition that Israel eliminates nuclear weapons.

The exchange of threats has exacerbated the situation in the Near East. Under these conditions Egypt's initiative was aimed not only at eliminating the threat of the mass destruction of the population of Near Eastern countries in the future but also at defusing the situation in the present. It is significant that it was advanced following President Mubarak's brief visits to Iraq and Jordan.

The leading Cairo newspaper AL-AHRAM points out that the UN secretary general has decided to send a group of experts in the disarmament sphere to the Near East in May to prepare proposals relating to the Egyptian initiative.

Commentary Says Iran Behind Lebanon Terrorists

TA2404195790 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Hebrew 1500 GMT 24 Apr 90

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Here is a commentary by our commentator about the hostages being held captive by terrorists in Lebanon.

This time there is reason to be joyful. The Islamic Jihad for the Liberation of Palestine released one of the U.S. hostages. [word indistinct] Robert Polhill had been held captive by the terrorists for over three years.

First of all, our congratulations to Polhill, his relatives, and friends. Still, the problem of the hostages persists. The Islamic extremists are holding 16 people: seven of them are U.S. citizens, while the rest are of various nationalities, including a Swiss. Most of them were kidnapped years ago, have not been heard from since, and may have been murdered by their captors.

Who are these terrorists? [words indistinct] anonymous, but what is clear to all is that behind all the Islamic Jihads, Islamic Revolutions, Oppressed of the Earth undergrounds, and the like is one force: Islamic fundamentalism, both of Arab and Iranian origin and, occasionally, also financed by the Iranians. After every kidnapping Jihad members go berserk when they announce yet another devastating blow against imperialism and Zionism.

This is the background for the almost daily violence in the Middle East, first and foremost, in Lebanon. As is always the case, the action of Arab extremists only benefits extremists on the other side of the fence, just as every act perpetrated by Israeli extremists only benefits Arab terrorists.

After every kidnapping the Israelis bombard Hizballah villages and PLO camps. Every strike is followed by some kind of guerrilla operation which in turn is followed by a retaliatory operation, and so on and so forth. Extremists [word indistinct].

Moderate Muslims have for a long time been voicing their fear that the acts of fanatics might inflict a tragedy on the entire Muslim world. To wit, when the world at large talks about terrorists it always associates it with some Muslim. The man-in-the-street in the Christian world associates Islam with violence. This, after hundreds of years in which Muslims maintained very good relations with members of other religions, much better than Christians did, to cite just one example.

Now a handful of terrorists is destroying the fabric of tolerance and coexistence. Moreover, the operational political mission of the Islamic terrorists would seem to be to further destabilize the situation in Lebanon so that Iran may be able to expand its area of influence in the Land of Cedars. On the other hand, Tehran makes no secret of the fact that it wants to export the Islamic revolution to Lebanon, which is incompatible with the interests of either the Arabs or Israel.

Ambassador to Oman Reassigned to Iraq

PM2404142590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed "Chronicle" report]

[Text] The USSR president has appointed Comrade Viktor Viktorovich Posuvalyuk USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Iraq.

The USSR President has released Comrade Viktor Viktorovich Posuvalyuk from his duties as USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Oman.

East Europe

Sajudis Agency Notes Solidarity Backs Lithuania

LD2604085190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0700 GMT 26 Apr 90

[Text] Sajudis Information Agency reports:

Warsaw: The second Solidarity Congress in Poland has passed a resolution which says: "The NSZZ [Independent Self-governing Trade Union]—Solidarity—Second Congress of the country's delegates, recognizing each country's right to freedom and independence, supports the declaration of independence proclaimed on 11 March by the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania. We appeal to all people of goodwill, nations and state governments, signatories of the Helsinki Conference Final Act, to recognize the declaration of independence by the Lithuanian people, which corresponds with this act.

We hope that Europe will soon become a common home of free nations."

The resolution was signed by the chairman of the congress, Jan Wieselowski.

TRUD Reports Solidarity Congress Opening

90YF0098A Moscow TRUD in Russian 19 Apr 90 p 3

[Report by S. Prokopchuk: "Questions Demanding Answers. Solidarity Congress Opens"]

[Text] Warsaw—The spirit of enterprise of the Poles and their ability to "make" money is a well-known characteristic. Therefore the decision of the organizers of the Second Solidarity Congress, which will begin its work today in its "capital," Gdansk, to at least partially compensate for the 1.5 billion zlotys it will take to conduct the forum did not surprise anyone. The more so since it was voluntary: If you want to be present in the Olivia Hall, take half a million zlotys out of the editorial cash box. This is for special correspondents. There is a rebate for those working permanently in Poland—they pay "only" 350,000.

In spite of such high prices for entry to the premises, where 487 representatives of about 2.2 million members of civilian coordination commissions will meet for an entire week, almost 400 workers of the press, radio, and television have already arrived to cover the congress.

The current congress is being held, incidentally, in the same building where the first Solidarity forum was held nine years ago. At that time in our official press we did not call its members anything but counterrevolutionaries and extremists...

The major issue attracting the attention of the delegates is the extent to which the current economic policy of "shock therapy" conducted by the Solidarity government headed by T. Mazowiecki corresponds to the interests of the workers and the entire country. What must be done in order to halt the onslaught of unemployment and sky-high market prices for food products and, as a result, the sharp drop in the standard of living of millions and millions of people, especially pensioners and families with many children. "Are we not trying to achieve our noble goals at too great a price?" "Are we not pouring it on too thick?"—such questions are being asked more and more frequently both on the pages of newspapers and from podiums in parliament.

And another question is arising before the beginning of the congress: What in essence will Solidarity be tomorrow? A "political trade union" as before or a new party based on it?

Local newspapers are still naming only one person as the natural candidate for the post of Solidarity leader—Lech Walesa. Well, time will tell how precise they are in their predictions.

Bucharest Demonstration Against Iliescu Reported

PM2404150390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Apr 90 Second Edition p 3

[TASS "Stop Press" report from Romania]

[Text] Bucharest, 23 Apr—Yesterday was the deadline for registration of candidates for the post of Romanian president. Three contenders for the country's top state post have been registered at the Bucharest central electoral bureau. They are I. Iliescu from the National Salvation Front [NSF], R. Campeanu from the National Liberal Party, and I. Ratiu from the National Peasants' Party. The candidacy of G. Popileanu of the Republican Christian Party was rejected. He had failed to secure the 100,000 signatures required for nomination.

The evening atmosphere in the capital has heated up. All approaches to University Square have been blocked. Adjoining streets have been cordoned off with tape in the three colors of the national flag.

We managed to establish that the square had been occupied by the participants in a rally organized by the National Peasants' Party, the Democratic Group of Center Parties, and other political associations, who had been joined by marchers from Timisoara. There had been several hundred people in all. Many of them were

waving tricolors, and the slogans "The NSF is a communist party," "Down with communism," and "We don't want Iliescu" had been chalked on the ground. Someone with a megaphone was urging people not to disperse, to preserve this "bastion of the struggle against the NSF and communism."

Hungarian 'Insinuations' on Troop Pullout Rebutted

PM2404150790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Apr 90 First Edition p 3

[Report by own correspondent Lieutenant Colonel A. Borovkov incorporating interview with Colonel General M. Burlakov, commander of the Southern Group of Forces: "Who Benefits From Insinuations?"]

[Text] Southern Group of Forces—A large number of articles have recently appeared in the Hungarian press whose aim is not concealed by their authors—to portray the Soviet forces in an extremely unfavorable light. This primarily concerns the military camps transferred by the Southern Group of Forces command last year to the Hungarian Defense Ministry in strict accordance with the plan for the withdrawal of Southern Group of Forces units and subunits from Hungarian territory. There are also allegedly incorrect payments for provisions supplied by the Hungarian side, and fabrications about cases of our servicemen selling weapons and ammunition...

In the first half of April the central Hungarian newspaper MAGYAR HIRLAP published an interview with Major General A. Annus, Hungarian Government plenipotentiary for the withdrawal of Soviet forces from the country and deputy chief of the Hungarian Army General Staff, under the heading "They Did Not Even Ask Permission for Construction." The interview dealt in a prejudiced and distorted way with questions connected with the troop withdrawal and the procedure for settling accounts for the installations left behind.

Your correspondent met with Lieutenant General M. Burlakov, USSR Government plenipotentiary for matters concerning the presence of Soviet troops in Hungary and their withdrawal and commander of the Southern Group of Forces, and asked him to comment on the article in the Hungarian press.

[Burlakov] It is bewildering that in his interview, Maj. Gen. A. Annus embarked on the path of revising a number of provisions of the agreement signed 1 April 1958. This applies primarily to the article whereby Soviet forces' expenditure on the restoration and major and routine repairs of installations are regarded as rent for using these installations. The Soviet side allocates over 1 billion forints annually for these purposes alone. In addition, in the past few years sizable resources have been invested in making over half of the leased buildings more comfortable, and particularly in installing central heating and hot water systems instead of stoves in them. Over 70 percent of the new buildings and installations have been constructed on the basis of Hungarian designs by the "Keszberg" firm and others at the Soviet Union's expense.

The interview also mentions "underground" construction. However, the author, as a professional soldier, should know that some installations are of a special nature and civilian organizations are not used to build them. Such construction was always agreed with the appropriate Hungarian organs and primarily the Defense Ministry.

We would really like to settle accounts as the military camps are vacated, and not after the complete withdrawal of the troops. Previous experience prompts us to do this.

A year after the camps were vacated and transferred to the Hungarian side, the Hungarians have started complaining to us about deliberate destruction of the buildings. The press systematically publishes exposes and photographs. It is worth asking what will happen after we fully vacate all the garrisons, which, as a senior leader of the Hungarian Defense Ministry once remarked, will not have anyone even to guard them.

I cannot remain silent on the problem of providing the Soviet forces with food. It is well known that a certain proportion of the food comes from the Soviet Union. The food products that are obtained in Hungary are paid for under contracts drawn up between Soviet and Hungarian foreign trade organizations.

The Southern Group of Forces makes all trade deals in accordance with the existing Hungarian laws. Payments are made from the USSR Defense Ministry budget. While there was mention of subsidies in favor of the Soviet troops, I consider it appropriate to recall the substantial difference in prices in favor of the Hungarian side in recent years with respect to a number of supplies from the USSR, for example, electricity, petroleum products, and rolled metal. This gives the Hungarian side, according to specialists' estimates, an annual profit of approximately $1.5 billion and, of course, covers the whole subsidy from the Hungarian state budget.

Now for the alleged cases of sales of weapons and ammunition. I can declare with the utmost responsibility that such things have not happened and could not have happened. I do not know whose purpose insinuations on this subject serve. After all, they clearly do not create normal conditions for the resolution of tasks relating to the withdrawal of forces, in which both sides are interested. Nor is it possible to agree with the definition, voiced in the interview, of the Soviet Army's liberating mission as an occupation. I think that this is not a fitting tribute to the 140,000 Soviet servicemen who died in battles for the freedom and independence of Hungary and its people.

New Payment System in Trade With Bulgaria Noted

LD2404133690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2020 GMT 23 Apr 90

[Excerpt] Sofia, 24 Apr (TASS)—From 1 January 1991 Bulgaria and the Soviet Union are to introduce a new form of trade payment—currency clearing. This means the making of payments in convertible currency, with state regulation of imports and exports. Accords on this new principle for payments were reached at a meeting of a Bulgarian-Soviet working group held here. The step is the result of CEMA decisions approved in January this year for wholesale renewal of the system of multilateral cooperation within the organization on market economy principles. It is also linked to the profound economic reforms being carried out in the People's Republic of Bulgaria and to the line for integration with the world economy. [passage omitted]

Civic Forum Blamed for 'Attacks' on CPCZ

PM2404160190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Apr 90 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Blinded By Anticommunism"]

[Text] Prague, 23 Apr—Czechoslovakia radiated peace and concord last Saturday and Sunday: The pope was paying an official visit. His sojourn markedly relaxed the tense political situation in the country.

But immediately after his departure it became clear that it was only a superficial calm. The first ordinary day demonstrated that passions have not abated, political rivalry is intensifying, and fierce attacks on the country's communist party are continuing.

The political prisoners' Confederation and the Nonparty Activists' Club today urged their supporters to assemble at 1700 hours in Wenceslas Square to give their support to Prague prosecutor T. Sokol, who has demanded that the capital's Communist Party of Czechoslovakia [CPCZ] organization be outlawed. Other organizations in the capital and other cities have urged similar actions.

The press has been particularly busy fueling anticommunist and, essentially, antidemocratic hysteria. The People's Party paper LIDOVA DEMOKRACIE obligingly printed a statement by an organization with a very meaningful name—the Party of Constructive Destruction. It peremptorily points out that "we see the disbandment of the CPCZ as the only guarantee of our country's free development."

It is echoed by the paper ZEMEDELSKE NOVINY, which says that the CPCZ is not keeping its promises and is not implementing the decisions made at the extraordinary congress. It will not bid farewell to its centralist past.

Comparing the CPCZ to fascist Germany's Nazi Party, the Klatovy "Civic Forum" demands that the party be outlawed because it is intrinsically unable to become a modern left-wing party.

Observers associated the continuing attacks on the CPCZ with the position of what is currently the country's main force—"Civic Forum." The "Forum" is seriously concerned that the communists' chances are increasing as the elections approach, as indicated by sociological research data. All is not well in the movement's ranks. Its press organ notes that recent months have seen an "oligarchical degeneration" of "Civic Forum" and its prestige among citizens is declining.

Against the background of the strong attacks on the communist party in Czechoslovakia, healthy appeals can also be heard. The key problems of modern society, Pope John Paul II stressed on Saturday in Prague Castle at a meeting with representatives of the intellectual elite, can only be resolved by means of dialogue.

I believe that the CPCZ must have a place in a pluralist political system in Czechoslovakia, J. Carnogursky, deputy premier of the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic government and chairman of the Christian Democratic Movement, noted in a RUDE PRAVO interview. If you follow the Prague prosecutor's logic, he said, the current government of national concord should not exist either, since it has communists among its members.

The current outburst of anticommunism raises serious questions about the predictability of Czechoslovak politics, the organization of society, and the distribution of forces in it. Why don't those who are behind the campaign against the CPCZ heed the opinion of an authoritative representative of the government, the president himself, and, finally, such a world authority as the head of the Roman Catholic Church?

Possible Effects of Pope's CSFR Visit Viewed

PM2504104790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by own correspondent L. Kornilov: "Czechoslovakia: The Pope's Visit"]

[Excerpts] John Paul II has ended a two-day visit to the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic. [passage omitted]

What is the church's social influence in the country today? Attempts were being made until quite recently to play it down, or at least to keep silent about it. It seems as if events in the near future will produce a sufficiently clear answer. I mean not only the consequences of the pope's visit but also the results of parliamentary and then local elections. Forecasts differ, but it is certain that the alliance concluded between the Czechoslovak People's Party (uniting the believers), the Christian Democratic Party, and the Christian Democratic Movement

represents a considerable force. It is even felt that this union will gain more than 50 percent of votes in Slovakia.

It is, of course, only to be expected that the visit by the head of the Roman Catholic Church to Czechoslovakia will strengthen the positions of the church and of rightwing forces (J. Carnogursky [first deputy premier and head of the Christian Democratic Movement] remarked in a recent interview with RUDE PRAVO: "I would place our movement to the right of center"). But the pope's arrival cannot fail to produce other results as well: To awaken people's sense of reconciliation, tolerance, and consensus. [passage omitted]

West Europe

Gorbachev Sends Message to FRG's Lafontaine

LD2604093890 Moscow TASS in English 0908 GMT 26 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 26 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev has expressed shock at the stabbing of Oskar Lafontaine, deputy chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany.

In a message to Lafontaine today, Gorbachev said "the Soviet Union knows you as a prominent politician who has contributed to the convergence between the two countries and strengthening European cooperation."

Gorbachev wished Lafontaine a quick and full recovery.

FRG's Kohl Cited on Interference in Lithuania

LD2604003190 Moscow TASS in English 2340 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] Paris April 26 TASS—Western countries should not take any steps and interfere in the events taking place in and around Lithuania. This may only aggravate the situation, West German Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl said in an interview with the Fifth Channel of the French television.

"Reasons should prevail," he said.

Kohl said he agreed with the decision of French President Francois Mitterrand and U.S. President George Bush not to impose any sanctions that could damage or impede perestroyka in the Soviet Union.

He said that everybody understood its importance. The liberation movement in Eastern Europe, including the German Democratic Republic, would have been impossible without it, Kohl emphasised.

Gremitskikh on Two-Plus-Four Talks, German Unity

AU2404211390 East Berlin HORIZONT in German No 5/90 (signed to press 9 April 1990)

[Dieter Hollmann report on interview with Yuriy Gremitskikh, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman and first deputy director of the Information Main Department "a few days before the Soviet-U.S. foreign ministers' talks in Washington"; place not given: "The Formula of Ottawa Is 'Two Plus Four Plus X'"]

[Text] In answer to my question, Gremitskikh said that he thinks of military neutrality rather than of neutrality in general, because the model of a neutral Germany might indeed be unreal in the conventional sense. At the same time, NATO membership of a united Germany has to be rejected. This would considerably shift the balance of powers to the USSR's disadvantage, not only in Europe, but all over the world. The situation is completely new, he said. NATO exists and it is not an association of flower-growers. What a balance this would be if NATO were to advance to the Oder-Neisse! A maximum project! The whole of Germany in NATO or the Warsaw Pact has nothing to do with realism. A compromise would be as follows: Germany in the two alliances or as a kind of link between NATO and the Warsaw Pact under special military conditions, which, for example, only permit armed forces for defense. One must be resourceful and think undogmatically, he said.

The Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman did not want to concretely answer the question what objectives Foreign Minister Shevardnadze's pursued in view of the forthcoming "two plus four" meeting in Berlin when he departed for his official visit to Washington in early April. However, he said that it is clear that the German problems, the prospects and conditions of the unification of the two German states will be a focal point of in the Soviet-American dialogue. The four powers' agreement on these subjects, which are decisive not only for Europe, is very important, he said.

As a Soviet Foreign Ministry statement says that "the participation of any other European state in the 'two-plus-four' talks in some form or another cannot be ruled out," I wanted to hear from Yuriy Gremitskikh whether it is not to be feared that the task will be complicated by increasing the number of participants.

According to Gremitskikh, the Ottawa formula means that the internal aspects of unificiation will be discussed by the two German states, while some internal questions also involve external aspects. As far as other states are concerned, some have already expressed their interest, for example, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia. It is not yet possible to be absolutely precise about the form in which their questions will be discussed. The "two plus four" group will have to do most of the work. However, it is in the Germans' very interest that unification will take place as harmoniously as possible and that a state of affairs which bears the seed for new conflicts between the Germans and other peoples will not continue to exist, he said.

What is hidden behind the keyword synchronization? Do we not have to expect negative consequences if unification is postponed because the pan-European process does not make much progress?

My interlocutor points out the process of developing pan-European institutions and new political, economic, and military policy structures. The abandonment of the two military blocs after some time and their transformation into political organizations, which will make room for pan-European security structures in the near future, are discussed. Synchronization also raises economic questions, but the military status is most complicated. A unified Germany must not be detached from the creation of pan-European security structures, he said. This question is now seriously discussed with the United States. This year the USSR is not only striving for agreements on halving the number of strategic nuclear weapons and reducing conventional armaments, but also for "Helsinki II." According to Gremitskikh, the Soviet Union hopes that the stages of the parallel and joint movement in the pan-European process and during German unification will be defined there.

In answer to my question about how he evaluates the differences in opinion on this subject at the Prague meeting of the Warsaw Pact foreign ministers, Gremitskikh said that one has to deal with new governments and new ministers and, as it were, a new understanding of things. However, the Warsaw Pact has not disappeared, although it is currently impossible to say how it will continue to work. The USSR regards its members as allies with whom it has interests in common and wants to continue its discussions.

USSR Wants Troop Treaty With United Germany

AU2404122190 East Berlin NEUE ZEIT in German 18 Apr 90 p 5

[NZ/E.W. report: "'Extraterritorial Status' for Soviets in the East of Germany?"]

[Text] The Soviet Union has expressed a wish to the FRG Government to conclude a treaty on the stationing of Soviet troops on the territory of today's GDR with a future all-German Government. As Bonn government circles told the PPD news agency, Moscow is striving for a "form of extraterritoriality," which would practically guarantee diplomatic immunity to Soviet military men. "The Soviets demand that we guarantee comprehensive personal protection to the soldiers in East Germany," a Bonn government official said. They are not to be subject to German laws.

It is said that the Kremlin is striving for a settlement, which guarantees greater protection to the Soviet troops stationed in the eastern part of united Germany than that of U.S. soldiers and the other Allied forces in today's FRG. The Soviets want a settlement, which deviates considerably from the NATO Status of Forces Agreement. In Moscow's view, German police should not have access to Soviet barracks in the various places.

It has been learned that the presence of Soviet troops in Germany after the reestablishment of unity has been the subject of talks between Bonn, Berlin, and Moscow for some time; the FRG Government consults with its NATO partners and does not negotiate behind the backs of the allies.

In 1957, the GDR concluded a treaty with the USSR on the stationing of the Soviet forces in the area between the Baltic Sea and the Erzgebirge mountain range. "In case of a threat to the safety" of the Soviet troops (formerly "Group of Soviet Forces in Germany," today "Western Group of Soviet Forces"), the Supreme Command in Wuensdorf near Berlin may take all appropriate measures it deems necessary. In the view of Bonn's legal experts, this general clause constitutes an emergency regulation without any possibility of participation by the GDR Government. "It must be considered as an essential restriction of GDR sovereignty," the experts say. In addition to the treaty on stationing, the GDR is linked with Moscow by the "Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance" (Warsaw Pact) of 1955.

If German unity is reestablished, today's GDR would have to be released from the Warsaw Pact, and the bilateral treaty on stationing would have to be replaced by a new agreement, the experts say. In addition, the occupation law, which the Soviets have only in Berlin, would have to be replaced. Bonn's experts proceed from the premise of a new status of forces agreement for Berlin and a new stationing treaty for the territory of today's GDR. According to available information, State President Mikhail Gorbachev considers the presence of Soviet troops in the GDR or in Germany as a "central issue." Independent of the decision of an all-German government, Bonn agrees to the presence of the Soviet Army in the future laender of East Germany.

According to Western findings, about 400,000 Soviet soldiers are currently stationed in the GDR. There are five armies of the ground forces with 10 tank divisions, eight motorized rifle divisions, and one artillery division. The army staffs are stationed in Neubrandenburg (2d Guard Army), Eberswalde (20th Guard Army), Dresden (1st Guard Army), Weimar (8th Guard Army), and Magdeburg (3d Assault Army). The "Western Group" has about 7,000 combat tanks, 3,300 artillery guns, and 400 multiple-rocket launchers. The Soviet air forces in the GDR are united in the 24th Tactical Air Force Army. They have about 1,530 combat planes and 530 combat helicopters. The Soviet units in the GDR are the most powerful of the Soviet Army in general.

Lukyanov Meets With Irish Parliamentarians

LD2504221490 Moscow TASS in English 1840 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Quotation marks as received]

[Text] Moscow April 25 TASS—A delegation from the Irish Parliament, headed by Senate chairman Sean Doherty, completed its visit to the Soviet Union on Tuesday.

During the visit, the delegation met Soviet parliament chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairmen of the parliament's chambers Ivan Laptev and Rafik Nishanov, and officials from the Parliamentary Committee for International Affairs and the Council of Nationalities' Commission for Nationalities Policy and Ethnic Relations.

The delegation also visited Uzbekistan.

A joint bilateral statement says that during the meetings, "held in the spirit of friendship and mutual interest, the sides discussed various aspects of Soviet-Irish relations and important international problems.

"The sides supported the all-round deepening and expansion of contacts between the supreme representative bodies of the two countries and their active participation in developing cooperation between the Soviet Union and Ireland and in ensuring peace, security and stability in the world, above all in Europe.

On behalf of the leadership of the national parliament, Doherty invited a Soviet parliamentary delegation to visit Ireland. The invitation was accepted with gratitude.

Interior Minister Bakatin Arrives in Cyprus

LD2504133390 Moscow TASS in English 1316 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] Nicosia April 25 TASS—Soviet interior minister, member of the Presidential Council Vadim Bakatin arrived in Cyprus on an official visit. He was welcomed by Cyprus Interior Minister Khristodoulos Veniamin at the Larnaca International Airport.

At the airport Bakatin noted that during Veniamin's recent visit to the USSR, the sides drafted a document on cooperation between the two countries in combating crime, which is to be signed now.

This document will lay the groundwork for cooperation between Soviet and Cyprus law enforcement bodies, Bakatin said. Now that the world is increasingly becoming interdependent, the fight against crime should be of global nature.

Veniamin praised the state of Cyprus-Soviet relations and expressed confidence in their further development.

EEC Foreign Ministers on Europe, Lithuania

PM2404135190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Apr 90 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "The Future of Europe"]

[Text] A one-day meeting of EEC countries' foreign ministers has been held in the Irish capital to agree on the agenda for the informal meeting of community state and government heads which will be held here on 28 April.

As Irish Foreign Minister G. Collins said at the end of the conference, the leaders of the Common Market countries will discuss in Dublin a number of problems connected with the process of German unification, relations with East European countries, preparations for the "Helsinki-2" conference, and the intensification of political integration in the community.

The heads of the Common Market countries' foreign policy departments gave their preliminary approval to the plan prepared by the Commission of European Communities for the integration of a future united Germany in the EEC. The document envisages the unification of the two German states and the GDR's joining the Common Market before 1993. The ministers also reacted positively to the Commission's program on the development of relations with the states of Eastern Europe. It is geared to the comprehensive development of economic, political, and cultural links with these countries, even to the point of their becoming associate members of the Common Market. It is expected that the draft documents will be approved at the 28 April meeting virtually unchanged.

The conference participants paid considerable attention to discussing the situation in Lithuania and adopted a joint statement on the matter. It points out, in particular, the need to "display maximum restraint and avoid actions that could further complicate the situation." The ministers expressed confidence that the only way to achieve a solution of the problem that is acceptable to all is through dialogue and they urged interested parties not to take action that is incompatible with this goal. At the same time, the meeting demonstrated that the community countries do not intend to recognize Lithuania as an independent state, give it economic aid, or resort to economic sanctions against the USSR. A spokesman for the Irish Government, which is chairing the EEC at the moment, announced at a press conference that this could lead to the destabilization of the political situation in the Soviet Union and would be against the interests of the Lithuanian people.

During the discussion of the plan to establish community political union, which envisages increasing the power of supranational organs in the Common Market—the Council of Ministers, Commission, and Europarliament—the ministers again failed to achieve unanimity on the question of the pace of political integration. Against the background of powerful support for the French-West German position on the need to establish this union as soon as possible, the British delegation again urged restraint. As British Foreign Secretary D. Hurd said at the press conference, London does not consider it advisable to rush the adoption of a decision on political union and does not agree to the delegation of broad powers to a "centralized government or centralized parliament." At the same time, the Foreign Office head expressed Britain's willingness to continue to participate in all discussions of the problems of establishing community political union.

In connection with the prospect of establishing a single EEC market in 1992, concern was expressed at the

meeting over the deteriorating ecological situation on the continent. The price of rapid economic growth should not be the further pollution of the environment, the meeting participants pointed out.

Latin America & Caribbean

Delegation Leaves for Nicaraguan Inauguration

PM2504105790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] A USSR delegation headed by V.I. Matviyenko, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for the Affairs of Women and of Family, Mother, and Child Protection, departed Moscow 23 April for Managua where it will attend events associated with the handover of presidential power in Nicaragua.

TASS Reports Nicaraguan Government Formation

LD2604081390 Moscow TASS in English 0613 GMT 26 Apr 90

[By correspondents Yuriy Dmitriyev and Igor Pshenichnikov]

[Text] Managua April 26 TASS—President Violeta Barrios de Chamorro of Nicaragua swore in the country's new government on Wednesday.

Enrique D. Morales was appointed foreign minister and Carlos Hurtado Cabrera became interior minister.

Chamorro will combine her presidency with the post of the defense minister.

Under a presidential decree, the number of Nicaraguan ministries has been reduced from 14 to 11. According to Chamorro, this corresponds to the democratization stage, which the country has entered. The government includes only civilians.

After swearing in the government, Chamorro signed a decree to abolish the law on universal military service. The decree terminates the military campaign and declares the demobilization of drafted servicemen.

She also signed a decree prohibiting symbols and the popularization of any political party in offices and public places and submitted a bill on a universal amnesty to the parliament.

Chamorro told correspondents that Nicaragua wants peace and harmony.

'Definitive' Cease-Fire Reached With Contras

PM2404142190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by APN correspondent A. Korzin specially for IZVESTIYA: "Nicaragua: Cease-Fire"]

[Text] Managua—Journalists kept watch for two and a half days outside the OAS mission building in Managua while talks continued between the Sandinist and Contra leaders. Toward the end some of my colleagues began to dispel the boredom of the long wait with a game of soccer. Others invited a band of Mexican singers—Mariachi—from a neighboring restaurant and the amazed faces of the participants in the talks appeared at the windows of the building as they struck their first chords.

Finally A. Cesar, former member of the Contras Directorate and now chief adviser to Nicaragua's future President V. Barrios de Chamorro, came down to us. He said that things were progressing successfully, a solution to many problems had been found, and the mission lights would not go out until a document was signed.

It was only on Thursday morning when it was already light outside that it became known that the sides had concluded an agreement envisaging a "definitive and effective" cease-fire. It will begin to come into force as of 1200 hours local time and should put an end to the nine-year war which has inflicted so many casualties on Nicaragua. The disarmament of the Contras is to begin 25 April—the day the new president is inaugurated—and will be completed by 10 June. The special UN peacekeeping mission in Central America will receive the Contras' weapons.

The talks involving delegates from Nicaragua's president-elect, the United States, the OAS, and M. Obando y Bravo, the head of the country's Catholic Church, took place amid a sharp increase in tension. Nicaragua is still confirming its established "image" as a country where it is impossible to predict for sure how events will develop in the next hour or two.

However, some forecasts are coming true. President Ortega himself promised the "shock" that the Nicaraguans got after the four-day Easter holiday. He said last weekend that mass protest demonstrations would begin in the country on Monday against the Contras' refusal to disarm before the new president takes office.

The scale of these demonstrations exceeded all expectations. Smoking automobile tires, hunger strikes by priests and believers, rallies conducted by war invalids outside V. Barrios de Chamorro's house, children reading grammatically correct statements in front of television cameras, and an avalanche of collective letters to the newspapers and on the radio. But all this pales before the wave of well-organized strikes that rocked the entire country and threaten to develop into a national strike. Bus drivers in Managua have already gone out on strike, and schoolteachers, miners, construction workers,

and tobacco workers did not turn up for work while the meeting was under way. A long wait in lines at gas stations owing to irregular gasoline supplies provoked serious concern—station workers can, after all, also strike. On Wednesday the tellers at bank counters stopped. On Thursday it was the turn of the water supply management services.

Apart from purely domestic inconveniences, these upheavals caused the tormented Nicaraguan economy fresh agonies. The strikers are demanding a drastic wage hike. Their demands can now be met only by means of the printing press.

Strikes are fueling passions, but it is not only economic demands that are behind them. On Wednesday, outside V. Barrios de Chamorro's house, D. Ortega said that he will hand over power 25 April regardless of whether or not the Contras disarm and whether or not the war continues in the country. In this connection some observers recalled something else Ortega said immediately after his 25 February election defeat: "We will hand over power but not our weapons." Observers regard the unexpected statement uttered by Cardinal M. Obando y Bravo, who usually holds a strictly neutral position and does not like "point-blank" statements, as a continuation of this logical chain. "Power will be divided in order to avoid civil war," he stressed. "He who has the weapons will have the greater share of power."

There are few people in Nicaragua who can see realistic prospects of the Contras' rapid disarmament, especially as no agreement regarding their demobilization has yet been fulfilled within the scheduled timeframe.

Supreme Soviet

Moscow TV Carries 25 April Supreme Soviet Session

Combatting of Chernobyl Effects Debated

LD2504133290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1200 GMT on 25 April begins broadcasting a recorded relay of the 25 April Supreme Soviet joint session in the Moscow Kremlin. The session is chaired by Anatoliy Lukyanov. A total of 403 Supreme Soviet deputies are present, and the session is in addition attended by 73 people's deputies.

At 1202 GMT Lukyanov makes the following remarks on procedural issues:

"Prior to beginning examination of the matters planned for today, I would like to say a few words about our work over the next few days, so we can orientate ourselves. You have a schedule. The guideline schedule, as you know, envisages that on Monday we are continuing work on discussing in the chambers the draft law on taxation of enterprises, associations, and organizations. That is what had been intended, but as you know it has not proved possible to do this. For this reason, in connection with this, it would clearly be expedient to hold separate sessions of the chambers in parallel, here and in the Sverdlovskiy Hall of the Kremlin on Friday, 27 April, in the morning, so as to complete examination in its first reading of the draft laws on taxes, and after lunch, at a joint session, to continue discussion of the draft law on pensions, and clearly, adopt it. I have just come back from a trip in the oblast, and I have to tell you that this law is very eagerly awaited there. Then, as we had planned, on Saturday 28 April this law could be adopted, and from 29 April a break in the work of the session could be declared. That's the plan."

At 1204 GMT Lukyanov introduces the first item on the day's agenda—the program for combatting the consequences of Chernobyl accident. He recalls previous measures that have been taken, the preparation of the program. He invites Doguzhiyev, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, to present a report.

At 1205 GMT Doguzhiyev recalls that the disaster happened four years ago. He outlines the general causes of the accident and the damage done in terms of agricultural land and enterprises put out of action. The cost of eliminating the consequences and the cost of the damage amounts to R9,000 million. He gives casualty figures and pays tribute to the memory of those who died.

At 1208 GMT Doguzhiyev outlines the government measures that were taken to cope with the accident in the initial stages. He quotes figures for the radiation and pollution levels in different oblasts and districts, quoting figures for the different elements. He says there was a real danger of radioactivity entering the water supplies but effective measures were taken to prevent this. He goes on to outline the way in which the reactor where the accident happened was dealt with. He notes that scientific research into the consequences was organized at the same time. Recommendations were made on a variety of measures to be taken in different fields, such as fish stocks and forestry.

At 1214 GMT he says the issue of decontamination is widely under discussion at the present time. Decontamination did produce good results, especially at the first stages of the accident. Tribute has to be paid to those who did the work. But now decontamination has to be done selectively, and not as a blanket operation over a wide area.

At 1215 GMT Doguzhiyev goes on to speak of the contamination of agricultural land and the measures adopted to cope with this. Milk production is being maintained, he says. Doguzhiyev then gives figures for the radioactivity found in animals in different places and at different times. He says decontamination of land through the use of mineral fertilizer has the drawback that it leads to increased nitrate levels.

Doguzhiyev Continues Report

LD2504143390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1219 GMT on 25 April continues its recorded relay of the 25 April Supreme Soviet joint session in the Moscow Kremlin. Council of Ministers Deputy Chairman Doguzhiyev continues his report by focusing on the medical consequences of the Chernobyl accident.

He speaks of evacuation, which was not carried out everywhere in an organized manner, and quotes average individual radiation doses in certain years. He gives percentages of different sections of the population in the affected zone who have suffered from certain diseases, like thyroid disease. He says improvements are needed in health care facilities and speaks about sanatoria and treatment facilities which are being made available to the Chernobyl victims. He then speaks of the radiation problems affecting children, aggravated by poor diet and poor food quality. Unfortunately the level of medical care provided gives rise to alarm, he states, and a new approach is necessary to safeguard the population.

At 1226 GMT he says that Chernobyl was unprecedented in the scale of its consequences. He speaks about the concepts used by the government, which were opposed by the Academies of Sciences of the Ukraine and Belorussia. He then outlines the evacuation requirements for people with different rem levels. This, he says, is an interim solution. He adds that the government has worked out a single program for eliminating the consequences and a concept for the safe residence of people in the affected areas. The government decided that there should in fact be two programs, an urgent program for emergency measures, and also a long-term program. More than 120,000 people face evacuation in Belorussia,

he notes. He then outlines other measures such as the provision of gas supplies throughout the area to reduce wood burning.

At 1232 GMT Doguzhiyev goes on to say that in the Russian Federation 60-80,000 people face evacuation. He notes that the program has been approved of by the government and discussed and amended in the commissions and committees. In the republics affected the concepts have been different, he says. The emergency measures program envisages the evacuation of those close to the maximum permissible levels. The emergency program consists of different parts—an all-union one, and a part relevant to the affected areas. He gives details of the first section of the program.

At 1237 GMT he goes on to explain the second section of the program. This includes requirements for the evacuation of people from the contaminated zone. Families with children must in every case be given priority. A state data bank will operate to record sickness. Foreign dosimetric equipment will be purchased, he says, and clinical bases will be expanded. Imported diagnostic equipment will be used in part. He adds that specialized treatment facilities will also be established. Additional facilities for travel to health resorts will be provided for people from the affected areas. He notes that vitamin deficiency among the population means that vitamins will have to be produced, including vitamin products for children.

At 1245 GMT he says the Council of Ministers has adopted a decision dealing with the question of compensation for those residing in the contaminated areas. He outlines specific concessions outlined. He speaks about health provision for those who participated in eliminating the consequences of the accident and benefits and concessions applicable to them. The emergency measures program also looks at what has to be done on agricultural land and in forests, he adds. Doguzhiyev then turns to the mass information media and the provision of information about the situation to the affected areas.

At 1251 GMT Doguzhiyev concludes by noting that the program and the report have been discussed by the relevant committees and commisions of the Supreme Soviet and have been approved by the government. Please support it, he says.

Deputies Cite Facts, Figures

LD2504145190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1252 GMT on 25 April continues its recorded relay of the 25 April Supreme Soviet joint session in the Moscow Kremlin.

At 1252 GMT Deputy Salykov, chairman of the committee for ecology and the rational use of resources, takes the floor. He speaks about things that still remain to be done in the area affected by the Chernobyl accident: True, a great deal has been done, he says, but we still face an ecological disaster. There has been much discussion of the economic aspects, relatively little talk about the spiritual side. The population is worried by the situation within a 30 kilometer radius of the site. One shouldn't be surprised that four years after the accident psychological conditions in the area are still tense.

At 1257 GMT Salykov outlines the discussions the committee has had with official bodies and individuals in the affected areas. He then criticizes the government about the length of time it has taken for these proposals to be made: They could have been put forward two or three years ago. He also criticizes the adoption of a universal 30-rem criterion: Individuals vary, he says. What we need, Salykov says, is the reasonable consolidation of all sources. He calls for support for the idea of setting up a special committee to supervise work following the Chernobyl accident. He says the newly formed committee must have bodies in the localities. Salykov then speaks of the need to provide care and information to those being evacuated.

At 1308 GMT Salykov concludes by saying that a lot of time has been lost, and we have to act according to our consciences. Please support and adopt the draft presented for your attention, he urges.

At 1309 GMT Lukyanov says that 65 deputies have put their names down to take part in the discussion of the report and program. He suggests limiting time on this subject to five hours. Let's begin by listening to representatives of the governments of those republics that have already discussed this matter, he says. He speaks of the need to avoid repetition and to give preference to deputies who have not spoken so far. He invites Konstantin Ivanovich Masko of the Ukraine, to take the floor.

At 1311 GMT Masko outlines the scale of the disaster as it affected the Ukraine. He speaks about the lack of information about what happened. Individual decisions were taken too late. But despite all that went wrong, he pays tribute to those who were the first to respond to the disaster, the servicemen of the Soviet Army. He speaks about the facilities that have alredy been provided for the victims of the accident. But if one compares the scale of the disaster with the scale of the things that have been done, then the comparison is certainly not in our favor. Four years later on we still do not have exhaustive information about the scale of the pollution by radionuclides. He then refers to the incidence of disease linked with the consequences of the accident. This gives rise to legitimate concern about what the future holds. The moral condition of people has reached a critical point. A complex program of work has been elaborated by the republic's government covering the period up to the year 2,000.

At 1320 GMT he concludes by proposing that additional evacuation measures be incorporated in the government's program and speaking about the costs

Seriousness of Accident Noted

LD2504152690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1322 GMT on 25 April continues its recorded relay of the 25 April Supreme Soviet joint session in the Moscow Kremlin.

At 1322 GMT Belorussian Deputy Prime Minister Kichkaylo takes the floor, noting the seriousness of the accident and its consequences. He speaks of Belorussia's agricultural and forestry losses. Please understand the misfortune that has befallen us and confirm the Belorussian government's program for dealing with it, he urges. Kichkaylo also speaks of the urgent need for evacuation and accommodation for evacuees. He appeals to the USSR Supreme Soviet to instruct the building organizations of Moscow and other places to build accommodation for victims of the Chernobyl accident. In our view, he says, the population's demand for resettlement is a just one. It is cheaper to evacuate a person than to bring in food supplies for him.

At 1335 GMT Kichkaylo talks about the loss of agricultural production being suffered by Belorussia and calls for the requirement for delivery to central stocks to be reduced.

At 1336 GMT Kichkaylo concludes by urging deputies to confirm the state program.

At 1337 GMT Nikolay Timofeyevich Trubilin takes the floor on behalf of the Russian Federation. He speaks about the severity of the consequences of the accident for the Russian Federation. Four years later, he says, there is no single set of tactics for dealing with them. He speaks about the additional medical facilities that have already been provided for coping with the situation. Improved medical facilities generally have been provided for residents of the contaminated zone. Not one case of radiation sickness has been brought to light. The state of health of the population of the regions that have been hit does give rise to serious concern, however: Immunity declines. There is no doubt that the burden of living in the contaminated zone plays a part in this.

At 1342 GMT he says people are asking when measures will be taken to guarantee life. We consider that it would be expedient to evcuate a large number of people living in a certain zone. The approach here must be a sensible one: Radiation contamination must be measured carefully in every individual location. Further work needs to be done on the government program if it is adopted today. We welcome the idea that a committee should be set up to coordinate, finance, and implement the program that is under discussion today. Furthermore, a nuclear energy safety program is vitally necessary. On resettlement and evacuation, he says the consequences of this will be substantial, but it is better to evacuate than have people remain in the affected areas. It would be a crime to underestimate the radiation situation.

At 1349 GMT Trubilin concludes by noting that the RSFSR government sees the program now under discussion as being an important topic for discussion at the forthcoming RSFSR Supreme Soviet session.

At 1350 GMT Lukyanov calls for five minute contributions.

Deputy Belov takes the floor; he recalls a demand made at the First Congress of People's Deputies for a referendum on nuclear power generation. Events are unpredictable in nuclear power. Nuclear power has the right to exist only if safety is guaranteed one hundred percent. He cites instances of previous accidents at nuclear facilities as mentioned in an article in TRUD. He recalls a visit he paid to a U.S. nuclear power station, where people are just as carefree as we are—no dosimeter was available to test the visitors. Nuclear radiation from stations working normally is impermissible. The myth of an ecologically pure source of nuclear energy has been blown away by the Chernobyl accident. He proposes that a point calling for a referendum on nuclear power generation should be incorporated in the decision which is to be taken.

At 1400 GMT an interval is announced.

At 1401 GMT the relay resumes.

At 1403 GMT Deputy Yelena Petrovna Lasuta takes the floor to convey as a woman and a mother the horror of the pain that was suffered by Belorussia. Picture the anxiety of not knowing whether the food one is giving to one's children is safe from radiation or not, she says. She condemns the attitudes of officials whom she accuses of having been indifferent to the fate of her nation. We responded to the grief of Armenia and that of Tashkent: Why are there people today who oppose help being given to ourselves? Foodstuffs are still not being checked properly, she says. The state program should be adopted today. We must appeal to the world community and to other states if things are not done for us.

At 1409 GMT Deputy Krishevich says that from the beginning the government worried not about people, but about the effect upon public opinion. He speaks of the increasing incidence of disease on Belorussia, the Ukraine, and the affected areas of the RSFSR, the Bryansk Oblast. He speaks of the impossibility of providing the supplies mentioned in previous decisions of the Council of Ministers. He proposes that the disaster be declared an all-union disaster and that appeals for help should be made to overseas countries. He calls for more evacuation measures.

Deputies Question Late Action

LD2504163290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1416 GMT on 25 April continues its recorded relay of the 25 April Supreme Soviet joint session in the Moscow Kremlin.

Deputy Zalygin takes the floor. He asks why do we do nothing on time? Why are we always late? Perestroyka is 60 years too late. One should not discuss a disaster four years after it happened! About the program—its first defect is that it contains no scientific forecast about what is going to happen. We don't have it because we don't want to have one. The Chernobyl disaster, like the Aral Sea disaster, should be regarded as a war disaster. The money to deal with such disasters should therefore come first and foremost from the military budget. Let's disarm all the quicker. Or let it come out of the space budget.

Zalygin continues with specific points of detail: Izrael wrote in PRAVDA recently that the government did not try to play down the scale of the threat from radiation. That, says Zalygin, is just not true: From the start we wanted to conceal certain circumstances and hush them up. It was only when information came in from Sweden that we started to stir. Shcherbina issued a Council of Ministers instruction about what could not be written about the disaster. Official censorship helped in this. Belov was right in calling for the whole nuclear power generation issue to be put on the proper footing.

Zalygin insists that all the costs to eliminate the consequences of the accident should be met by the Defense Ministry, the space undertaking and another.

At 1423 GMT Deputy (?Yezhikov-Babakhanov) takes the floor. He speaks of the enormity of the tragedy, which is understood in Kazakhstan where the Semipalatinsk test facility has been sowing sickness and fear for 40 years. However, the people will always come to the aid of those in trouble, he decides.

At 1427 GMT Deputy Firsov takes the floor. He speaks of the need to develop the production of milk products required by radiation victims and particularly children. If resources were made available to his association they would rapidly be able to launch large scale production of these products.

At 1435 GMT Deputy Gurenko speaks. Everyone expects the Supreme Soviet today to act out of the highest moral principles. The rem-level mentioned in the government program must be regarded as mistaken. He calls for an emergency law on the Chernobyl accident to be worked out. Why are we still doing things too late, he asks. Work on eliminating the consequences must be coordinated in a single center. Gurenko proposes that a special directorate should be established to monitor health care in the affected zones. The children require specialists from abroad. On the whole I support the draft program: Please support it, and the republican program, he urges.

At 1440 GMT Deputy Nechetnaya, Bryansk Oblast, takes the floor. Bryansk today faces enormous difficulties arising from the Chernobyl accident: I continually receive appeals for help, she says. She gives figures illustrating the scale of the disaster as it affects the Bryansk Oblast. Much has been done as far as decontamination is concerned but much of it was temporary and does not satisfy the population. She lists various areas of work which are not proceeding as quickly or as thoroughly as they should. There are shortages even of conventional medicaments. The incidence of disease is rising. We are particularly worried about our children. She calls for the state program of urgent measures to be adopted with amendments.

At 1451 GMT Deputy Platonov of the Belorussian Academy of Sciences takes the floor. The problem of the safe residence of the population in the affected zones is a key one at the present time. He refers to a recent document signed by 1,500 scientists protesting against the concept adopted by the program as regards safe radiation levels. The 35-rem concept is not scientifically grounded, he says. The problem arises from lengthy exposure to low radiation doses and this is very difficult to quantify because it is difficult to exclude other factors that may be playing a part when one is studying the effect of low level radiation. There are two points on which everyone agrees: the effects on the thyroid gland and the effects on the immune system. What is less clear is the potential gene-mutation threat posed by the 35-rem level. Zalygin was right to ask why the program does not contain any forecast. Finally Platonov draws attention to the particular situation in which Belorussia finds itself—the whole republic ought to be declared a disaster area. He calls for all deputies to support the program.

Deputies Note Affected Areas

LD2504165190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 25 April continues its recorded relay of the 25 April Supreme Soviet joint session in the Moscow Kremlin.

Deputy Maslin takes the floor. He says that we are facing very short time limits. He speaks of the Telethon television fund raising campaign and mentions some of the things on which the money raised will be spent. Numerous offers of help for victims are being received from within the USSR and outside it. However, the help being received needs coordination and in this connection Maslin suggests that a special committee be set up. Maslin suggests additional wording for incorporation in the decision to be adopted.

At 1506 GMT Deputy Shcherbak takes the floor. Shcherbak speaks of the Homo Chernobylis—a man without trust in the authorities responsible for dealing with the problem. He calls for the officials responsible for covering things up with regard to pollution to be exposed. He criticizes various shortcomings in the way the disaster has been handled. He calls for aid to be made available to Kiev. The commission must also establish the lessons that are able to be learned from Chernobyl to ensure that another similar accident does not happen again. He also calls on all deputies to stand for a minute's silence in memory of the victims.

At 1512 GMT Deputy Feskov speaks about the program and says that in fact the consequences cannot be eliminated; they are there for all time. He goes on to take issue with individual points in the program.

Feskov goes on to stress the vast area of territory affected by the Chernobyl accident and the shortage of health and rehabilitation facilities in it.

At 1528 GMT Deputy Borodin takes the floor. He says that a government committee to deal specifically with Chernobyl is of course a necessary thing. The radiation problem is indeed a problem for the whole country. About the program of urgent measures spanning a two-year period: It should of course be approved, but it should be cleaned up. In particular there should be systematic attention and a systematic approach to all medical investigation and treatment problems. Medical centers are needed in each of the oblasts that have been affected. These must apply a single medical doctrine. Finally he says that we have heard from everyone except those representing the agencies responsible for the accident. It is time they thought about saying something, he concluded.

At 1529 GMT Lukyanov says that Academician Velikhov, as an academic who has worked on preparing the program, has been contacted and will appear later to speak. The session breaks for an interval.

At 1530 GMT the relay of the evening sitting resumes.

Lukyanov calls on deputies to register their attendance. The panel shows that 385 deputies have registered. Discussion continues of the government program. Deputy Venglovskaya has the floor.

At 1533 GMT Venglovskaya talks about the real situation in the affected areas of Zhitomir Oblast. She has visited all the tough regime regions. The total area contaminated is more than 900,000 hectares. The Doguzhiyev report contains half-measures. She suggests that the emigration criterion could be determined by the radiation level of locally produced milk. People ask when they are going to be given individual dosimeters. The situation with regard to food supplies and especially children's food supplies is bad. People are showing signs of panic and trying to move out. Specialists, teachers and doctors are moving out. The oblast's plans are realizable if assistance is given by the central government. Finally she suggests that accomodation be provided in health centers and resorts for people from the affected areas.

At 1541 GMT Deputy Luchenok speaks. He wants to speak about the moral aspect of the disaster. The roots of our problems today go back far into the past. The decision to evacuate people from the contaminated regions should have been taken long ago. Can we go on knowing that countless children are endangered by what we call the peaceful atom? He calls for the international mass media to involve itself in efforts to heal the wounds. He also calls for the program to be confirmed. Finally he says that people should be provided with necessary medicaments, medical apparatus and dosimeters without charge. People expect from us not fine words but good deeds. He supports Shcherbak's call for a special committee to monitor what is being done.

At 1546 GMT Deputy Drunina takes the floor. Today we are discussing the really important thing—the people whom we have betrayed into a truly biblical hell. It is only now that an operation rescue for children hit by radiation has gotten under way in Belorussia. The 35-rem concept, she says is immoral. The disaster is a disaster of the whole country and the whole country must help.

At 1553 GMT Deputy Golovnev says that these past four years have been terrible because they have been years of expectation; but now there is a fifth year ahead. Each year has been a year of assurance that all would be alright: until the fourth year, which has been a year of contradictions, of revelation of secrets. Belorussians have never asked for anything. Now we demand that normal living conditions should be created for our children and grandchildren. He calls for the program to be approved, with certain additions that he has proposed.

Velikhov Notes Scientific Work

LD2504175790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1614 GMT on 25 April continues its recorded relay of the 25 April Supreme Soviet joint session in the Moscow Kremlin.

Lukyanov offers the floor to Deputy Sidor, who describes Chernobyl as our special pain, which is not confined to individual regions. Villages in Sidor's oblast are showing excessive radiation levels. The Japanese have done much to overcome the effects of radiation on people, but the Soviet example leaves much to be desired. He urges a series of measures to remedy the problem, for people are entitled to live in unpolluted regions.

At 1619 GMT Deputy Samarin criticizes the Doguzhiyev report for overlooking Russian oblasts, including his own, Orel, which suffered from Chernobyl radiation. He agreed with the deputies who have asked where the funds are to come from to finance the program. A commission of deputies to investigate the causes is necessary.

At 1624 GMT Deputy Priymachenko pleads the case of the people of Kiev Oblast who were affected by Chernobyl and lists his own efforts to secure assistance for them. The authorities are still declining to acknowledge the link between Chernobyl and the increase in serious illness among children in his area. The USSR Ministry of Nuclear Power Engineering is the main culprit in this affair, but all governing bodies must act responsibly to help those afflicted, he says. The Supreme Soviet must

consider the Chernobyl station's future fate. He enumerates other measures which he considers necessary.

AT 1631 GMT Deputy Grakhovskiy refers to the effects of Chernobyl on the people of his oblast, Gomel. The immediate government reaction was helpful, but there have been delays and a loss of interest in the case since. The program is urgently awaited by the people affected, who are currently deprived of adequate medical aid. People in the oblast are tired of waiting. The local authorities have done their bit to sort things out. He expressed opinions on individual provisions of the program and makes a number of proposals.

At 1640 GMT Lukyanov calls Academician Velikhov to the floor. Velikhov describes the work done by scientists over the last four years inside the fourth unit of the Chernobyl station. This work will continue, to determine the causes and eliminate the effects. What to do with the polluted territory within the 30 km zone will be a task for the next five years. Chernobyl's units 1 and 2 have been altered to guard against a recurrence of the accident; a program to take them out of service has been elaborated, for they are first generation units. Unit (?3) will function for longer, as it is a second generation unit. Mankind has never lived on completely clean land. We are hoping for help via the forthcoming telethon.

At 1648 GMT Lukyanov cites a memo from the head of the Academy of Sciences radiological institute taking issue with Velikhov's view on safe radiation levels. He then reads out a list of deputies who asked to speak but did not get the chance, for Deputy Zelinskiy thought it important that people should know this. He reads out a memo from a group of deputies calling for Izrael to appear before them. Lukyanov proposes that the debate be concluded, followed by statements from Izrael, Doguzhiyev and Salykov and the adoption of the program.

At 1652 GMT A deputy asks for all deputies' proposed programs to be published. Lukyanov agrees, then goes on to take a vote on whether to conclude the debate: 335 for, 18 against, four abstentions.

At 1654 GMT Izrael from the State Commitee for Hydrometeorology takes the floor, smmarizing his committee's activities over the past year. The committee has published maps and devised a procedure for getting information to people in the regions. The relevant authorities have been given information on pollution levels. People in the affected regions have received various benefits. The necessary information was made available to all organizations involved in eliminating the effects of the accident. Measurements were taken according to the agreed criteria at each stage. The number of measurements will have to increase greatly if a provision for voluntary evacuation from affected areas is approved. He focuses on Korosten, in Zhitomir Oblast, where pockets of high radiation have been detected.

Izrael considers the question of evacuating Kiev raised by one deputy and recalls that the Ukrainian authorities did decide to evacuate small children to unpolluted areas at the time. On the subject of information centers called for in the program, he urages that they be combined with press centers, to avoid distortions. He answers questions given to him by deputies about the role of the International Atomic Energy Authority and other international bodies. The coordination which has extended thus far is necessary, he maintains.

Doguzhiyev Answers Questions

LD2504183690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1714 GMT on 25 April continues its recorded relay of the 25 April Supreme Soviet joint session in the Moscow Kremlin.

Doguzhiyev returns to the floor and proposes to answer questions on individual points submitted by deputies, which he runs through quickly. In particular, the money allocated to the Nuclear Power Industry Ministry was well spent. Those who were involved in the clean-up work are being looked after by the relevant bodies. He cites figures for radiation levels to which given numbers of people were exposed. He stands by his view that the design of the unit merely encouraged the accident, but was not the main cause. The people involved in eliminating the effects immediately after the accident did a great job, even if they did make mistakes; such mistakes should not be dug up.

At 1726 GMT Doguzhiyev notes that Japanese experience was taken into account, but not copied as efficiently as it might. He cites figures for recent reduction in food supplies from afflicted regions in Belorussia and answers a number of other written questions on individual aspects of the Chernobyl issue. Servicemen working in the region enjoy benefits, as do civilian workers, he says.

At 1736 GMT Doguzhiyev continues answering written questions on Chernobyl and related issues, some of them handed in as he has been speaking. He summarizes the elaboration process which the program has gone through to date. He proposes that the wording be used as in the draft decision and that it be noted that the Council of Ministers has approved it.

At 1749 GMT Deputy Korneyenko asks a question from the floor about social tension in affected regions. Doguzhiyev replies that all urgent measures are being tackled. Another deputy draws attention to the difference between approval and fulfilment. Doguzhiyev promises that a long-term program will follow, independent of today's program of urgent measures.

Lukyanov urges objectivity and calm when examining the issues involved and invites another deputy to ask a question from the floor on the concerns of Gomel people. Lukyanov comments that the interests of the

whole state have to be considered, too. Doguzhiyev recaps government decisions aimed at protecting people from excessive radiation.

At 1759 GMT Deputy Labunov urges Lukyanov to put a Belorussian-proposed program to the vote. Another deputy asks about the future activity of the Khmelnitskiy nuclear power station. Doguzhiyev replies that it is not relevant. Zhuravlev urges that everything concerning urgent measures, from 1990-1992, be confirmed now and the rest merely approved for the future.

At 1803 GMT Ryzhkov, speaking from the floor, says that some kind of decision, and a correct one, must be adopted today. The government has singled out very precise measures. Confirmation of the program will enhance the Supreme Soviet's prestige. He agrees with Zhuravlev's view and calls for top international experts to be brought in to consider further measures.

At 1806 GMT Ryzhkov agrees with Lukyanov's wording of the draft decision on confirming a program of urgent measures. People are waiting for measures to be taken. The program will cost R16 billion, amounting to one year's growth in national income.

At 1811 GMT Lukyanov invites more comments from the floor on the program. One deputy calls for extra resources to finance the government program.

At 1813 GMT Lukyanov proposes that Point 1 should become Point 2: to confirm the program of urgent measures for 1990-92 proposed by the USSR Government on the basis of republican programs. The other will be to approve the long-term programs of the RSFSR, the Ukraine, and Belorussia and to instruct those republics' governments to do further work on them.

At 1816 GMT Lukyanov invites deputies to register, prior to voting. Registration shows 380 deputies present. He moves on to the vote on the amended text proposed by the government: 372 for, one against, one abstention. The amendment is adopted.

At 1818 GMT Deputy Timchenko calls from the floor for deputies' amendments and additions to be taken into account. Lukyanov puts the proposal to the vote: 332 for, eight against, 16 abstentions. The amendment is passed.

At 1820 GMT another deputy calls for the decision to include a ban on agricultural production in infected areas. Doguzhiyev, speaking from the floor, outlines the government's position.

Chernobyl Resolution Approved

LD2504192790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1823 GMT on 25 April continues its recorded relay of the 25 April Supreme Soviet joint session in the Moscow Kremlin.

Salykov takes the floor and presents Lukyanov with a new proposed wording—a unified program of measures—but Lukyanov asks deputies informally whether this should be put to the vote; he decides not to. Salykov reads out another proposal: to set up an interdisciplinary forecasting center. No vote is taken. Another proposal was for a referendum on nuclear power. The committee feels that there is no need for one.

At 1828 GMT there is a discussion on whether to stop agricultural production on contaminated land, revolving around wording of the text. The amendment is put to the vote: 104 for, 194 against, 37 abstentions.

This is followed by further discussion on amendments to the text, including the financial aspects.

At 1838 GMT the resolution on Chernobyl is put to the vote: 346 for, zero against, six abstained. Lukyanov congratulates deputies on the result of the vote. Various deputies have put forward a question about the Khimprom accident in Ufa—he has decided to hand the questions on to the government.

At 1840 GMT Laptev takes the floor to point out certain discrepancies in the voting on a draft law discussed yesterday, and asks the two chambers to take another look at certain articles in the bill, and also to set up a conciliation commission. Voting on these matters takes place.

Resolution on Chernobyl Passed 25 April

LD2504180690 Moscow TASS in English 1732 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Report by TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow April 25 TASS—Today, on the eve of the fourth anniversary of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station, the Soviet parliament passed a resolution on a unified programme of additional measures to deal with its after-effects.

A colossal amount of work has been accomplished over the past four years, but the measures taken appear to be insufficient, the resolution points out. The extent of radionuclide contamination had not been fully documented.

The majority of scientists described as unsound the concept that a person can be exposed safely to 35 rems over 70 years of his life, which has been officially accepted until now. As a result, a highly tense sociopolitical situation has formed in areas affected by radiation.

In today's resolution the USSR Supreme Soviet endorsed a Union- Republican programme of urgent measures for 1990-1992, presented by the government. Under the programme, from 180,000 to 200,000 people will be resettled from the contaminated areas of the Ukraine, Belorussia and Russia.

The programme, which costs 16 billion roubles, also provides for the organisation of comprehensive medical aid to the population and measures to stabilise radiation levels in the contaminated areas. It is the first stage of a long-term state programe, the elaboration of which the government plans to finish this year.

The parliament recommended to the USSR Council of Ministers setting up a state committee to clean up the consequences of the accident. The governments of the Ukraine, Belorussia and Russia are advised to form similar bodies in their republics.

The government of the country was charged with drafting a bill on the Chernobyl accident that should, in part, define the legal status of its victims and participants in the efforts to deal with its aftermath. A bill on the use of nuclear energy and nuclear safety is also to be drafted.

The resolution of the Supreme Soviet commits the USSR Council of Ministers to develop, this year, scientifically-grounded criteria for radiation safety and, by September, to draft and endorse a special programme, "The Children of Chernobyl."

Measures are to be adopted to stop, as soon as possible, the production of the contaminated territory of foodstuffs which do not conform with safety standards. The government will have to elaborate an array of measures to phase out the Chernobyl nuclear power station.

Gomel Deputy Considers Aftermath Program

LD2504121190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1030 GMT on 25 April carries a 10-minute report by Andrey Nikiforov from the Kremlin on the 25 April joint session of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which is examining the state program for eliminating the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Electric Power Station and a draft decision on the issue. He speaks to People's Deputy Nikolay Stepanovich Feskov from Gomel Oblast in Belorussia. Feskov suggests that the Chernobyl accident should be defined as a catastrophe. He says: "The implementation of the program in Belorussia alone will require up to R18 billion for the 5-year plan."

Feskov singles out two areas of top priority: material provision, namely immediate resettlement from areas where the health of the population is threatened; and scientific, including medical, support for the program. He believes that the state program lacks sufficient provision for the second area, and that it should stipulate the need for international cooperation in overcoming the disaster. Agreements have been reached between Belorussian specialists and the French on direct cooperation this year.

Nikiforov asks Feskov why there are two figures—94,000 and 2.2 million—for the number of people in Belorussia to be resettled.

Feskov says that there is no concept of a safe level of radiation for places of habitation. The government has agreed that 30-35 rems is insignificant and if this is taken as the criterion for level of safety, then the first figure applies. If the safe level has no limit, then the second figure applies. He believes that work should be carried out urgently to elucidate what dosage of radiation is harmful for life. Nikiforov notes that many "fairly extreme views" were expressed at the session about the bankruptcy of nuclear power engineering in general. Feskov responds by saying that unfortunately there is still no alternative to nuclear power engineering, and that there is a need for a new approach to the issue. Measures should be taken to ensure that people are protected from such catastrophes as Chernobyl. Many problems remain to which we do not yet have the answer. Feskov concludes by hoping that the draft decision will be adopted.

Doguzhiyev Gives Report on Chernobyl

LD2504224890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1205 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Report by V. Doguzhiyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, at the 25 April session of the USSR Supreme Soviet joint session in the Kremlin—recorded]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] In carrying out the decisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet of 27 November 1989, the government examined the republican programs and elaborated a common program to eliminate the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl station. A number of important questions, which I have already mentioned, were revealed without the solution of which a common program cannot be devised in the long-term. We must obtain a thorough detailed knowledge of the radiation situation, I have already spoken about this, including of strontium and plutonium, to work out a concept of man's existence in safety on territory polluted by radionuclides—I spoke of this—to receive a reliable forecast of the migration of radionuclides in various media and to work out methods of forecasting and evaluating the socioeconomic consequences of the measures taken. A committee of specialists recommended that before these and a number of other questions are resolved, a program of urgent measures for 1990-1992 should be elaborated, the implementation of which would make it possible to form the conceptual basis of the long-term program. Both the republics and the central government discussed this question and arrived at such a decision: That two programs are required—a program of urgent measures to eliminate the consequences of the accident and a long-term program for, maybe not until 1995 or even later.

The republican programs have been remodeled. They single out the 1990-1992 stage and have been examined

and approved by the government. To speak briefly on these programs, well, generally speaking, a whole set of measures necessary to eliminate the consequences of the catastrophe are envisaged.

In particular it is envisaged that more than 120,000 people will be resettled from the polluted zone in Belorussia and that the requisite supply of housing will be built for them according to the norms, taking into account the conditions of those living in the polluted teritories—because some people will remain there—I am talking about approximately 6 million square meters. It is also planned to build all the support facilities, such as water mains, drainage and heating installations. I should make the proviso right away that all these questions depend on the number of those resettled or the remaining inhabitants or on those requirements which we ultimately have to develop in the conditions where the populations reside. The gasification of the polluted rayons in all three republics is planned which will make it possible to eliminate the use of wood contaminated by radioactivity. A major set of measures to improve healthcare in the rayons which suffered and transport, roads, trade, services, education and culture is envisaged. All these questions have also been taken into account in the republican programs.

In the Ukraine it is planned to resettle all those living in the rigorous monitoring zone and, apart from this, approxiamtely a further 60,000 or 80,000 people from a less contaminated zone from among families with children up to 14 years of age and with pregnant women and, accordingly, to build over 2 million square meters of housing for the population being resettled, as well as strengthening the health care facilities, out-patient institutions, polyclinics and hospitals. Measures are envisaged to develop people's education, to improve trade, cultural services and so forth. In the Russian Federation, the program to eliminate the consequences provides for the resettlement of 60,000 to 80,000, including, in the first instance, 21,000... 15,000... 16,000 [numbers as heard] of those who must be resettled, 21,000-25,000 people from among families with children under the age of 14 and pregnant women.

Measures have been set out to construct housing and essential social, cultural and everyday facilities for people who suffered from the Chernobyl accident, including the construction of a Russian republican scientific and training center for radiation medicine in Bryansk in 1991-1993. I cannot fail to mention here that this radiation medical center in Bryansk revealed the attitude of our people to the problem. When this problem was raised a number of ministries said that they wanted to take part in financing in hard currency the first category of that construction. The Ministry of Automative and Agricultural Machine-Building, the Ministry of Heavy, Power and Transport Machine-Building, the Ministry of Defense Industry, the Ministry of Railways, the Ministry of Radio Industry, the State Agrochemical Association, the Ministry of the Timber Industry, the Ministry of Energy, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of the Electronics Industry, and the Ministry of Atomic Power, along with the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation signed a document on the construction and financing of that center. I think that this example demonstrates the attitude to Chernobyl.

A state program of urgent measures for 1990-1992 has been elaborated and on 21 April of this year it was approved by the government. The program was discussed in the committees of the Supreme Soviet which introduced into it, well, many proposals and amendments. All of this was taken into account and it has been worked through and in this form it was approved by the Council of Ministers on 21 April.

I have to say that in the republican program those issues which have not been resolved and which I have spoken of today are in one way or another having their effect; that is, a varied approach to the concept and a varied approach to how to evacuate, from one curie or from 15, or rems, or some other way. All of this, of course, bears out that if you have varied approaches, then accordingly you get varied results, and it's difficult to say where the truth lies. This is the reason the immediate measures appeared at this stage. We all adopted common approaches, common principles, so that, over this time, if we are asked to resolve this task, solutions can be found to these conceptual questions. The program of immediate measures includes such matters as evacuating those people whose dose of radiation in the recent period is approaching the stipulated limit; then evacuating families with children of up to 14 years old and pregnant women from territories contaminated above 15 curies; elaborating a precise concept for ensuring people's safety, and on this basis deciding on the evacuation and the adoption of safety measures in every population center; a sociological survey of the population to find our their place of residence and work, and on this basis, elaborating a scheme of plans for resettlement; radically improving medical services and the health of the population, and other matters. You have the details, and I think this spares me the need to go into detail on this.

In structure, the program of immediate measures consists of the all-union part of the program—the union block—three republican programs, and programs have been worked out, separate, special programs on the alienation zone. No single one of these programs, well, in any case, the union part of the program is isolated from the republics; it cannot operate separately, it operates with the republican programs.

The first section of the program concentrates on matters relating to the scientific back-up for the immediate measures, and on the coordination of the activity of scientific research organizations on the problems of the Chernobyl disaster. The main areas of scientific research are presented, the leading organizations and establishments are set out, and an expansion in international cooperation is provided for. The work of this section should actually provide us with answers to the questions which I have already spoken of on the concept of safe

residence, that is, the migration of nuclides and the protection of ground waters, and the radiation nuclear safety of protective facilities, I have already mentioned this. Such a program is now being elaborated, perhaps we could even announce a competition of designs to create a protective cover, designed to withstand all kinds of spontaneous effects within the power set's internal structure, to exclude the possibility of radioactive contamination of the environment. I think that one of the matters which we didn't cover earlier is the legal, social, and psychological aspects of eliminating the consequences, that is, an integrated approach is provided for to examine the interconnections of various problems relating to the elimination of the consequences of the disaster. The coordination of expert work will be carried out by a coordinating council with the participation of the Academies of Sciences of the Ukraine and Belorussia. The appropriate financing of this work and the building work to serve this work is provided for.

The second section of the program provides for measures to protect the health of people living on the territory who have been subjected to radioactive contamination, or who have taken part in the elimination of the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster. It consists of several subsections. The first one relates to monitoring and (?insulating) the radiation situation. I have already spoken about this. We must conduct detailed measurements with due account of the landscape and geophysical conditions and soil features. We are planning this work with the involvement of other ministries and departments apart from the State Committee for Hydrometeorology, that is a wide-ranging involvement, so that in 1990 we can improve our knowledge of the radiation situation by conducting detailed investigation of population centers in Kiev, Zhitomir, Gomel, Mogilev and Bryansk Oblasts, and as the next stage, in a number of other oblasts.

In 1993 the program envisages the compilation of a map of the radiation situation on the territory of the European part of the union.

The second subsection is the resettlement of inhabitants from the polluted rayons. In elaborating this subsection we were guided by the conditions which I have already mentioned, that the first stage—that is mainly in 1990—is to resettle inhabitants from the populated areas, the decision on the resettlement of whom was already taken last year. This comprises approximately 20-23,000 inhabitants. The second stage is to resettle in 1990-1991 the inhabitants of those populated areas the decision on the evacuation of which was taken at the beginning of this year, 1990, after the radiation situation and dose levels had been made more precise and detailed or were connected with the reduction of agricultural production due to the high—over 40 curies—level of the population.

At each stage preference should be given to families with children under the age of 14 and pregnant women. Overall, in the two stages of 1990-1991, it is intended to resettle the inhabitants of 395 populated areas with 70-80,000 people including: Belorussia, 306 areas with 38-40,000 people; the Ukraine, 22 areas with 19-20,000 people; Bryansk Oblast 67 areas with 15-18,000 people.

Third, children under the age of 14 and pregnant women should form the third stage. In 1991-1992—leaving aside those who will be involved in the obligatory evacuation in 1990—we must evacuate from the zones which I have mentioned children, families with children, and pregnant women. Here, individual doses in the zones are lower than 40 curies, guaranteed below 35 rem, therefore we plan this for 1990-1992.

In accordance with the proposals and calculations of the union republics it is proposed to resettle before 1998 approximately 110-130,000 of this category of people. Altogether, in accordance with the program it is proposed to resettle from the polluted territory 180-200,000 people including: in the RSFSR, 50-80,000 people—the reason for this spread is that the figures are to be made more precise according to the results of measurements and polls; in the Ukraine, 40-43,000 people; and in belorussia, 90-94,000 people.

The republican programs and the draft program of urgent meausres envisages the resolution of the complex of questions of medical aid to the population which has been subjected to radiation. With this aim a special scientific program is envisaged which unites the strength and resources of the leading scientific-research institutions and establishments. A most important direction of the work is the ecological and health assessment of the consequences of the accident. It will make it possible to make an all-around assessment of the various sources of favorable influence on the organism. In particular, it is planned to find out more precisely the role of hot particles in the formation of the radiation levels in the population.

This will be facilitated by setting up and ensuring the operation of a state data bank to record the radioactive pollution on the territory.

In order to carry out medicodemographic and epidemiological monitoring of the population it is intended to equip specialized scientific institutions with modern diagnostic apparatus including imported equipment.

In parallel with the development of domestically manufactured apparatus purchases will be made abroad of modern apparatus for biological dosimetry and the systematic analysis of data from the screening of the population. It is envisaged that specialized establishments will be set up, including eight antenatal diagnostic centers, seven medicogenetic clinics, eight immunological laboratories and so on and so forth: All of this is in the documents.

A considerable expansion of clinical and scientific bases at existing institutions is being planned. This includes the construction of the republican center in Bryansk that I have already mentioned.

The program provides for the supply of modern diagnostic apparatus to the central rayon hospitals in the above-mentioned oblasts, including imported apparatus.

A special place in the program is occupied by issues concerning the provision of medical assistance to children and pregnant women. These include carrying out medico-demographic and epidemiological monitoring of children, pregnant women and women of fertile age who have been subjected to the effects of radiation as a result of the accident; the development and implementation in territorial health care establishments of automated monitoring of children's health; and the study of the influence of the remote consequences of the Chernobyl accident upon the state of health of pregnant women, of women in childbirth, of women immediately after confinement, of newly born children, and children during the first year of life.

The program also includes the working out of scientifically grounded indications and contraindications covering the sending of children for treatment at sanatoriums and health resorts.

The creation of a number of specialized health care establishments is envisaged, including a laboratory of the all-union scientific research institute for children's health centers and physiotherapy—based on the (?Doil) sanatorium—which will develop methods for the restorative treatment of children who have been subjected to the effects of radiation. It is envisaged that about 400,000 travel packages to sanatoriums and resort establishments, recreation and tourism establishments, pioneers' and health camps will be allocated each year for the treatment of children and adults who have suffered from the Chernobyl accident.

I have to say that in 1990 we are planning to increase by several times the allocation of travel packages and in this matter considerable assistance is being given by the trade union, the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] and not just the AUCCTU but the trade union organizations of the republics and oblasts. Several of them have sponsored these rayons and we hope that this year the situation will be much better than next year [as heard]. The figures are all available; who is getting how many travel arrangements, these are know to the republics, and it is our task to try to ensure that this is what happens.

In addition we are counting upon the enterprises and the trade union organizations in the enterprises fulfilling completely the Council of Ministers' decision under No. 886 of the Council of Ministers and the AUCCTU that no less than five percent of travel arrangements for the summer period be allocated for children, parents accompanied by children and pregnant women from the rayons that have been hit.

The program of urgent measures and the republican programs envisage that a number of specialized sanatoriums, health resort and health center establishments should be set up. The appropriate capital investment is being planned for these purposes—more than R120 million.

The shortage of vitamins among the population and especially among children makes it essential to work out scientifically based allowances for the feeding of different groups of the population and food products with curative and preventative value that contain protective elements against radiation and enterosorbents for the purpose of reducing the dosage load upon the population and raising the resistance of the organism to the effects of unfavorable factors.

It is envisaged that special production facilities will be set up for the manufacture of vitamins and other food products intended primarily for the children. Essentially we are embarking upon the creation of a subindustry for the production of these goods.

The two following subsections determine the measures of material and social compensation for the population resident in the affected territory and those who participated in the elimination of the consequences of the accident. On these questions the Council of Ministers, fulfilling the decision of the Supreme Soviet on examining the republican programs and taking decisions on issues within its competence, has adopted jointly with the AUCCTU appropriate decisions which have been the basis of these subsections.

Velikhov Remarks on Chernobyl

LD2504215390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Remarks by Academician Velikhov at the 25 April session of the USSR Supreme Soviet proceedings at the Kremlin; speech is joined in progress—live]

[Text] ...work out a program for their withdrawal from use. The third set can work for slightly longer out of economic considerations, because of its state, from the safety point of view—it is a second generation set and it has a number of additional internal safety systems. It is natural that the chief problem today is developing not at the station itself, not in the fourth set, but in places where millions of people have, indeed, been caught up. And I am in complete agreement with the program we have here. In those places where agricultural work cannot be carried out, where children are restricted to staying in schools and buildings where they sit for many hours in school premises and the possibility of their communing with nature and living a real life outside is restricted, all this results in very grave consequences and to indirect consequences, not only to the direct consequences of radiation. So, in places where normal rural life cannot be carried on, the population should be evacuated. Incidentally, I have always said this.

At the same time, I have to tell you, comrades, that this should not lead to any exaggerations and to the incorrect information which one sometimes hears. Speaking for

myself, I believe that those 40-50 rems which we normally receive professionally when working in such conditions, this is a completely normal dosage which does not, in my view, significantly threaten my health. That is my view and I am not, after all, voicing it or attaching it to those people who found themselves in these conditions, not of their own free will.

Sometimes it is said that we can only live on absolutely clean territory, in absolutely clean conditions. Throughout the life of humanity and, generally speaking, throughout the life of existence on this earth, there have never been such conditions. A radioactive background is an absolutely real thing which surrounds us. And not only outside us, because there is radiation inside us as well. Because there are isotopes, then there are isotopes of thallium and a number of others which are constantly breaking up inside us and so, comrades, this radioactive background does exist. So when people say that it is possible to live on absolutely clean territories, such territories have never existed in the history of mankind. The entire genetics of humanity are based precisely in conditions of this background and no such territory will ever exist.

Therefore, in this respect, I think that the concept that is adopted in the decision is correct. No one should live in places where normal life is impossible. From the agricultural point of view, of course, it would be very important to use conversion in order to, so to speak, enhance both the conditions and technology of those people whom we evacuate. Of course, no one should be forgotten—not one of those who dealt with the accident, who worked in conditions of the Chernobyl disaster.

This is a very major program because when we speak here and draw comparisons with Japan, we should bear in mind that the tests that were done, the volume of tests that were done, say, in Japan, the analysis of the damage within the chromosomes themselves, which most directly shows the degree of irradiation, are very small compared to what we have to do. In this respect, we are hoping in the telemarathon to appeal to the world community, find contacts with it. This is, indeed, a global catastrophe and we are counting on help.

Ryzhkov Answers Correspondents on Chernobyl

LD2504221990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] Today Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, answered the numerous questions of journalists in a break between the sittings of the session. Listen to a recorded fragment of it, please:

[Begin recording] [Ryzhkov] Have a look at the Chernobyl program. We have spent R9 billion, today we authorize R16 billion, that is R25 billion. Imagine, say, that this same Belorussia left to face this problem on its own, or Armenia left to face the tragedy by itself. Are they in a position to do so? That's why we need to strengthen the country, and then we will be able to solve these matters.

[Correspondent] Nikolay Ivanovich, tell me please, you are saying that we must remember those who were undertaking some, one might say, heroic actions in eliminating this accident. But the point here is what to do about those who didn't perform? Now quite a lot is said about the responsibility of many people who were negligent to some extent during the Chernobyl accident. Somehow the majority of them didn't shoulder any responsibility. Many of them didn't inform their population about [word indistinct].

[Ryzhkov] Hold on. And who, in your opinion, didn't perform?

[Same correspondent] Possibly I have in mind the fact that the issue of the responsibility of the USSR Ministry of Health heads—who at that time misinformed the population—is now being raised in the Ukraine. Could this be an incorrect evaluation?

[Ryzhkov] I believe that there was no malicious intent. I state it firmly. If, as they say, you don't believe the living, then believe the dead. Take the article by (Gubarev), which was about (Legasov) and read it. Legasov managed to dictate it before his death and Guburev published it all. Believe the dead person. He, Legasov, said that the commission that worked at that time—and what do I mean by the commission? As if I was on my own!

We invited this same Ukrainian health minister, we invited him several times. We finished everything and took this line: Even if there was the slightest uncertainty and we had to move in this direction, we moved without fail in this direction. If we say today that we really did not do something, then this is only because we did not understand many things. We did not have any experience, after all.

[Female correspondent] Nikolay Ivanovich, I would like to return to Moscow. Seventeen firemen [indistinct interruption!"...six now"] who died at Chernobyl are buried, as is well-known, at the Mitinskoye Cemetry in Moscow and Moscow has still not built a monument to them despite Mossovet's decision. Well, it is evident, all the same, that this injustice will be corrected but nevertheless Moscow, with its population of 9 million and its huge number of enterprises which in general may serve as sources of some kind of infection, may [changes thought] we have several reactors, research reactors. It is evident that the new Mossovet also needs some kind of program, an all-embracing program of measures which would create a reliable barrier against such incidents happening at all. Does it not seem to you that a reduction in professionalism in relation to work with nuclear power engineering is taking place?

[Ryzhkov] We need to pay our dues to those lads who died. There is no question here. A common monument

needs to be built. there was such a decision and Mossovet needs to concern itself with this issue. As far as the radiation situation in Moscow is concerned, well, the general picture is known to you. It is normal, so to speak, and it is constantly monitored, but it is necessary to look specifically. We really do have many institutes which use isotopes and not always correctly, as they say, use waste and everything possible. Therefore, this matter needs to be returned to. What you say now that, well to a certain extent, perhaps, there is a backwardness in nuclear issues—it seems to me that the opposite is now the case, that this Chernobyl accident is of course a syndrome. It will be, in my view, in people's consciousness for a very long time. And as a person I understand the fact that people today are opposing atomic power engineering. A great deal of work has to be done with regard to safety. We must have....

[Correspondent interrupting] Structures, yes?

[Ryzhkov] Yes, we do not have to have dual or triple safety, but perhaps five fold guarantees that there is safety. We need to cooperate more with the FRG, with France and with other countries which work a great deal in the sphere of automation and improvement. Of course we have done a lot now as well but I think that from the point of view of the safety of nuclear reactors, one must never stop, never. [end recording]

Religious Subcommittee Meets on Bill

LD2504171490 Moscow TASS in English 1653 GMT 25 Apr 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow April 25 TASS—A subcommittee for humanitarian issues, part of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for International Affairs, met today to finalise a bill on the freedom of conscience and religious organisations. It was attended by deputies and representatives of departments, political parties and movements, public and religious organisations.

Speakers included chairman of the Liberal-Democratic Party Vladimir Zhirinovsky, USSR People's Deputy Nikolay Tutov, People's Deputy of the Russian Federation Gleb Yakunin and academician Boris Raushenbakh. They were unanimous in the opinion that the future law should be based on the gains of modern civilisation, on international norms, the Helsinki and Vienna documents.

Many speakers stressed the need to grant the status of public to religious organisations and to give the rights of a judicial person to the church. Metropolitan Vladimir insisted that the bill take into account the critical remarks made by the holy synod of the Russian Orthodox Church.

Representative of Muslim and Judaic communities, and Christian Baptists also submitted their proposals.

At present, the draft law on the freedom of conscience and religious organisations is being finalised at the USSR Council of Ministers.

Constitutional Compliance Committee To Be Elected

LD2604093690 Moscow TASS in English 0721 GMT 26 Apr 90

[by TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow April 26 TASS—The Soviet parliament is meeting today to elect a constitutional compliance committee.

The committee is to be formed under a decision of the second congress of people's deputies last December, which elected Sergey Alekseyev to head the new body. Alekseyev, a corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences, previously chaired the parliamentary committee on legislation.

In addition, the Supreme Soviet is to discuss the second reading of a bill delimiting the functions of federal authorities and republics.

Defining the powers of the federal authorities and the joint responsibilities of the center and the republics, the bill delegates the other matters for republics themselves to decide upon. It specifies that the powers of the center may not be broadened without the republics' consent.

When the second reading of the bill began to be discussed on April 10, many deputies opposed its adoption without the document's discussion first by the parliaments of the republics. This clearly affected the results of the vote: Only the name of the bill was passed at the time.

Political & Social

Issues 'Skirted' by Central Committe Platform

PM2504115590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Apr 90 First Edition p 2

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences and Candidate of Juridical Sciences Yu. Kachanovskiy under "Congress Platform: Party and Perestroyka" rubric: "What Kind of Concept"]

[Excerpts] Khabarovsk—The draft CPSU Central Committee platform defined goals which have the support of the overwhelming majority of Soviet people—building a society based on humane, democratic socialism, centering politics on people, creating a regulated market economy, asserting democracy and people's self-management, and renewing the party. But how is this to be achieved? How are we to proceed toward the new society? In my view, the draft does not provide an exhaustive answer to a number of pressing questions. The reforms have only been outlined in general terms.

However, the country has found itself in a worsening crisis. [passage omitted].

Since the draft platform does not analyze in depth the reasons for the crisis, naturally it also gives a poor indication of ways to escape from it. I consider it a matter of necessity and fundamental importance to emphasize the question of defending Soviet society from the forces which are endeavoring to mess up the country. Such forces do exist, they are operating in an increasingly aggressive manner, and blood is being shed with increasing frequency. Further. Only hopelessly naive people can fail to see the true aims behind the unprecedented campaign which has been mounted today against the Armed Forces. Discrediting them in public eyes and demoralizing personnel involves dislodging yet another factor for stability from the foundations of perestroyka.

In this situation there can be no question of eliminating political organs within the Army and Navy and depoliticizing the Armed Forces. The draft platform must make this clear.

I believe that the draft Central Committee platform has also skirted a number of other important issues relating to the life of the party and the country. If the decisions of the 28th CPSU Congress are also reduced to this level, the party's prestige will be well and truly undermined. This may have unpredictable consequences for the country. [Passage omitted].

Roundtable Comments on Gdlyan Affair

90UN1491A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 15, 14-20 Apr 90 p 8

[Roundtable discussion with USSR People's Deputies N.I. Ignatovich, V.A. Semenov, and I.V. Sorokin, moderated by P. Lukyanchenko for ARGUMENTY I FAKTY: "What Is in Store for Gdlyan and Ivanov?"]

[Text] Judging by our mail, many of our readers are interested in this question, as well as the question of whether the commission of deputies for verifying materials associated with the operation of the USSR Procuracy investigative group headed by T.Kh. Gdlyan has succeeded in establishing the whole truth concerning this affair. Taking account of our readers' wishes, we sponsored a roundtable discussion in which the following members of the commission took part: USSR People's Deputy N.I. Ignatovich, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Issues of Glasnost, Rights, and Citizens' Appeals; USSR People's Deputy V.A. Semenov, senior justice counselor and candidate of physical and mathematical sciences; and USSR People's Deputy I.V. Sorokin, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Issues of Legal Order and Fighting Crime and senior inspector of the Criminal Investigations Division. We are offering our readers the materials of the roundtable.

[Lukyanchenko] Has the commission accomplished the tasks it was charged with?

[Ignatovich] I am not satisfied with either the commission's course of work or its results. Its failure was obvious from the very beginning. The commission did not have a clearly defined status, and for this reason we did not know what we were or were not entitled to do.

[Semenov] The leading figures of our state, M.S. Gorbachev and A.I. Lukyanov, said at the first congress that our commission would be given unlimited rights. At the time, I thought this was enough.

[Ignatovich] The reasons the commission was dooomed to fail were as follows:

—there are 16 USSR people's deputies on the commission; of them, nine are members of the USSR Supreme Soviet and of permanent committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet, so virtually no time was left for work on the Gdlyan commission;

—there are only a few professional lawyers on the commission; the others are quite far removed from the issues of investigation and administration of justice. Their incompetence has affected our work in the most pernicious manner. An interview with cochairman of the commission R. Medvedev on TV Channel One on 7 April is a graphic example of this; we can only refer to this presentation as aggressive incompetence.

[Lukyanchenko] Who did the actual work on the commission?

[Semenov] Only five people: Deputies N. Strukov, V. Aleksandrin, I. Sorokin, V. Pokhla, and myself. What is my assessment of the results of the commission's work? We should be just now starting our work, whereas we are forced to wrap up. You are going to ask me: Are the charges leveled by Gdlyan and Ivanov against the leaders of the party and the state justified, is there corruption in the top echelon of power? My answer will be: Yes, there is. I have come to this conclusion on the basis of logical reasoning after familiarizing myself with the Khint and Smirnov cases.

The commission has received many complaints and letters regarding the violations of socialist law by the Gdlyan group. To be sure, it is not ruled out that almost all of these letters and complaints may be viewed as a massive organized attempt to discredit the investigators. Nonetheless, several documented facts do confirm violations on the part of Gdlyan and his group.

[Lukyanchenko] Which facts?

[Semenov] Pursuant to the law on procedure, confiscated valuables should be inventoried in detail on the spot. Certainly I understand that these were large batches of valuables, and that it was difficult to inventory them in detail at the place of confiscation.

[Ignatovich] It was virtually impossible.

[Semenov] Well, at least impound them.

[Lukyanchenko] Were they not impounded?

[Semenov] If an expert study done by the USSR Procuracy is to be believed, an attache case with valuables was confiscated, and the investigators did not impound it. At any rate, the act of impounding was not entered in the protocol. Besides, one set of attesting witnesses was present at the time of confiscation, and another at the time of inspecting and inventorying the valuables. This is also a violation.

[Ignatovich] No, it is not, because this is not compulsory under the law.

[Semenov] A second group of violations—the law on procedure does not provide for filing charges against relatives.

[Ignatovich] Why? If the relatives of the accused were suspected of concealing valuables acquired through criminal enterprise they could be apprehended under the law. It is another matter that there were many complaints concerning so-called psychological pressure on the persons investigated, threats of severe punishment up to execution by firing squad. Ilyukhin, head of the investigative group of the USSR Procuracy on the Gdlyan affair, referred to this in particular at the meetings of the commission. However, I cannot consider these facts proven. Until this happens, the principle of presumption of innocence should be applied to Gdlyan.

[Sorokin] I would like to go back to the issue of the confiscation of valuables. I am a practitioner myself, I have worked in the Ministry of Internal Affairs for nine years now. I know from my work experience that at times you face such conditions that you cannot either inventory or impound the objects confiscated; you cannot even find attesting witnesses.

I was outraged by the manner in which R. Medvedev referred in his TV interview to "muddle-headed" investigators who use "strange phrases" about rings made "of a yellow metal" with "glass." He is unaware that the law provides for this very description. Judge for yourselves: How can an investigator tell professionally a gold object from a copper or gilded one at the location of confiscation, and say whether this is diamond, crystal, or glass? This is up to the employees of the Bureau for Merchandise Analysis. Incidentally, the law does not call for their participation in confiscation.

[Ignatovich] I should say that the leadership of the USSR Procuracy interprets the law so arbitrarily in the course of evaluating the operations of the Gdlyan group that it is altogether surprising. On the one hand the group is accused of, for example, subjecting the arrested N. to intensive daily interrogations for a month. In another case, Gdlyan is accused of exactly the opposite—he failed to interrogate an accused for half a year. However, the law on procedure does not set forth a schedule of interrogations. For example, does it make sense for me to interrogate daily a person who denies everything categorically? I should gather the evidence of his guilt or innocence, and only then summon him to be interrogated.

[Sorokin] I believe that the USSR Procuracy has no legitimate right at all to investigate Gdlyan and Ivanov, because it is an interested party. Why? Gdlyan has accused his superiors of destroying the case on Uzbekistan and Moscow, sometimes improperly, but often justifiably. Justifications for Gdlyan's assertions have been confirmed in part by our commission as well: We have come to the conclusion that the cases of Smirnov, Khudayberdiyev, Osetrov, and Orlov were either dropped without sufficient grounds, or their investigation was completed hastily, in a purely pro-forma manner. I am certain that not only the USSR Procuracy was interested in the case being destroyed. It becomes clear who else was interested in destroying the case, because the individuals against whom Gdlyan had filed charges were high-ranking functionaries of the party apparatus.

[Lukyanchenko] What about the 11 suicides of witnesses and accused which, in the words of R. Medvedev, are on the conscience of Gdlyan and his group?

[Ignatovich] During the entire period of operation of the investigative group headed by Gdlyan four people took their own lives, of whom one jumped out of the window after being summoned to an interrogation and surrendering the valuables while others, in anticipation of unavoidable exposure, did so either at home or in a hospital room....

In his interview, Medvedev stated that a preliminary investigation of the Gdlyan and Ivanov case has been completed. From my conversation with Ilyukhin, supervisor of the investigation of their case, I understood that only the part of the investigation that may be carried out without interrogating the accused has been completed. I find it easy to predict the further course of events because the USSR procurator general has recently been granted the right to keep the accused under arrest for up to one-and-a-half years. Let us assume that the Supreme Soviet consents to filing charges against Gdlyan and Ivanov. Ilyukhin will promptly have them arrested and sent to investigative isolation cell block for one-and-a-half years.

[Sorokin] After that, 10 years in a high-security colony are in store for them.

[Ignatovich] Meanwhile, one wave of demonstrations, rallies, and strikes after the other will sweep the country. This is what is strange: This is exactly what the leadership of the USSR Procuracy does not want to understand. I told them: "We do not live in a rule-of-law state yet. We cannot yet say as they did in ancient times: 'Long live justice even if the world shall perish!' Your decision should not be legal only. It should primarily be political." If we had a rule-of-law state in our country at present, if I had no doubts about the impartiality of the

investigation, supervision by the procuracy, and the court, I might press the button in favor of consenting to filing charges against Gdlyan and Ivanov next week during the vote in the Supreme Soviet. But, pardon me, why should two common and, incidentally, not by far the worst investigators be punished for all the flaws of our law-emforcement system?

[Sorokin] I think it is safe to say that the results of the vote in the Supreme Soviet will depend on the array of political forces rather than legal norms. Gdlyan and Ivanov have stated publicly that they are opponents of the political regime, opponents of the CPSU apparatus. We will hardly succeed in changing the opinion of the authorities in favor of Gdlyan and Ivanov. At the same time, I am aware of the opinion of voters throughout the country and not just in Moscow and Leningrad. The Supreme Soviet cannot fail to take this into account.

[Lukyanchenko] As I understand it, the commission is not of the same mind regarding the fate of Gdlyan and Ivanov.

[Semenov] When we made a preliminary report at the second congress we were not of the same mind either. This is why the agreed-upon text of the report looked so eclectic. However, I am going to insist that I be given the floor if my opinion differs from that of the majority of commission members.

[Lukyanchenko] Incidentally, there still is persistent talk of cochairman of the commission Yarin, who read this report, leaving out some very important segment.

[Sorokin] Deputy A. Bichkauskas, a member of our commission, indeed inserted a sentence about the virtual impossibility of conducting an investigation of high-ranking leaders in the present situation.

[Ignatovich] It is very annoying for me to listen to the accusations concerning the supposed destruction of the case on corruption leveled against our commission by Gdlyan. If anybody contributed to the destruction of this case it was Gdlyan's approach to proving crimes rather than the commission. Had his investigative group paid enough attention to investigating the sources of origin of the funds used as bribes (undoubtedly, they were procured through criminal enterprise, by padding, and so on), had the group documented it, the cases would not be falling apart today. Meanwhile, look at what is happening: The accused begin to retract their previous testimony in court, and the entire prosecution falls apart.

[Sorokin] I disagree. Firstly, every professional has his own approach. Secondly, this was the largest corruption case to date, and this is why the investigative tactic of Gdlyan was non-traditional.

[Ignatovich] For the sake of fairness, I would like to say that at present Gdlyan is accused of all the lawlessness wrought in Uzbekistan, of arresting thousands of innocent people. This is a lie. During this entire period, Gdlyan and his group arrested or temporarily detained only about 160 people. The thousands mentioned at present were charged by other investigative groups, other prosecutors whom Gdlyan had nothing to do with.

[Lukyanchenko] As has become known, a group of Uzbek people's deputies recently demanded that the culprit of many troubles of the long-suffering people, Rashidov, be politically rehabilitated.

[Ignatovich] Yes, it is true. I read an article signed by five USSR people's deputies and published in the Fergana Oblast newspaper which asserted that Rashidov was an outstanding son of the Uzbek people who has done a great deal for the Uzbeks.

[Lukyanchenko] Was pressure brought to bear on you as members of the commission?

[Ignatovich] Personally, I felt no pressure.

[Semenov] Pressure on the commission did exist after all—nobody wanted to reckon with us and our decisions.

[Sorokin] Personally, I was pressured. I was summoned on two occasions to the central apparatus of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and advised to be more "discreet," to publish less in the press, and promised to be given "a sturdy back" in return—that is, promotion in the service. However, I do not need it at this price.

[Ignatovich] It is almost beyond a doubt that initially the Gdlyan group was under the patronage of someone who was highly placed. Even a combat helicopter was at his disposal. This is a significant sign. However, this patronage lasted up to a certain point. Later, they were told: "Boys, you've got to stop. You've done your bit, it is time for you to quit." But "the boys" had no desire to quit. Hence the end result.

[Semenov] The persecution of the investigative group began in 1989. By that time, four delegates of the 19th party conference had been arrested, and testimony against quite a number of ranking functionaries of the CPSU Central Committee apparatus had begun to appear. Immediately, the facts of violations of socialist law by Gdlyan and his group were "found." Former leaders of the USSR Procuracy Katusev and Karakozov stated at the commission meeting that as soon as Gdlyan began to interrogate ranking party bosses the stream of complaints increased, and inspections by party echelons became an everyday occurrence.

This is where it all began. On 28 April 1989, IZVESTIYA published an intermediate order of the Supreme Court on the Khint case. I studied the Khint case carefully and reported on it to the commission. I found no violations on the part of Gdlyan. I am certain that highly skilled lawyers, members of the Supreme Court who issued this anti-Gdlyan intermediate order, knew this well. Why did they agree to sign a document that cannot stand up to criticism from the legal point of view? I have one explanation to offer: It was exactly at this time that former First Secretary of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan Central Committee

Usmankhodzhayev testified about the case of giving a bribe to USSR Supreme Court Chairman V. Terebilov.

This intermediate order was not used for Terebilov's defense only. As documents in the commission's possession indicate, KGB investigator Dukhanin produced this order together with an anti-Gdlyan article from PRAVDA of 30 April to the accused in the corruption case, and obtained from them a retraction of the testimony previously given concerning ranking functionaries of the CPSU Central Committee. I believe that this does not deserve comment.

[Ignatovich] In all honesty, I do not at all understand why they came down on Gdlyan like that. After all, all the violations by Gdlyan are nothing compared to the damage inflicted by the former highly-placed leaders who have brought this state of affairs about in the country and who nonetheless are not only free for some reason, but also take advantage of the entire set of benefits and privileges.

As a people's deputy, I resent the fact that our commission and the entire Supreme Soviet are still treated like raw recruits who are ordered to form a file and "Forward march!" and later "About face, march!"

[Semenov] When I started working in the commission I thought about establishing the objective truth. However, I now understand that we have been used as a smokescreen.

[Sorokin] Even if the Supreme Soviet decides to throw these two representatives of the people to the lions because of someone's political ambitions, I will not leave it at that, whatever it may cost me. We, the deputies expressing the will of the voters, should bring this endeavor to a full and lawful conclusion.

Working in exceptionally difficult conditions, Gdlyan and Ivanov at times allowed mistakes and negligence to occur. However, there were no deliberate violations of the law in their actions, and this is exactly the main point.

Confusion Reigns at Komsomol Congress Over Appeal

PM1904090990 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 17 Apr 90 pp 1, 4

[N. Kopylova and Yu. Bespalov report: "Congress Gets Its Way"]

[Text] The arguments at the congress began in the first minutes, but the real stumbling block came only on Saturday. The debate over the CPSU Central Committee letter "For Consolidation on a Principled Basis" which had begun in the first days of the congress continued in the "Party and Komsomol" [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] discussion center and then at two edgy and turbulent plenary sessions. An eloquent fact: Ye. Ligachev and V. Medvedev, members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, I. Frolov, Central Committee secretary and chief editor of PRAVDA, and Yu. Ryzhov, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Party Building and Cadre Policy Department, took part in the debates on this topic.

It is easy to explain the close attention shown by the party leaders. For the first time ever a Komsomol congress has made a daring attempt to express disagreement with the positions expressed in a CPSU Central Committee letter and to adopt an independent political decision.

Diametrically opposed viewpoints on the Central Committee letter emerged quite swiftly: "We have no right to interfere in party affairs" and "The letter will cause a turn to the right, we simply must define our attitude toward it." Small wonder that three draft congress appeals on the Central Committee letter were immediately submitted to the discussion center. The first viewpoint was expressed by the draft of A. Zolotov from Gorkiy. The second was expressed by the texts submitted by the Leningrad delegation and the group of USSR people's deputies together with delegates from Volgograd, Kuybyshev, Moscow, and Vologda Oblasts and the Ukraine.

In the immediate aftermath it is difficult to give a coherent and logical account of this rather confused and tense debate. But we hope that even a few extracts from the chronicle of the debate will help to give an idea of the argument.

N. Yashin, Kemerovo: "I don't know about you, but certain slogans and certain phrases make me think of the distant past, of what we all now recall with horror."

V. Gichanskiy, Belorussia: "...Many comrades who get money from the party's coffers and see nothing immoral in this have attached themselves to the party. They spend their eight hours at work drawing up platforms for fear of fouling up.... I think that, if not at this congress, then at the conference that we are going to try to convene toward the end of this year, we will have to adopt a similar letter on consolidating the Komsomol's forces unless we have a clear shakeout now."

Yu. Ryzhov attempted to introduce some clarity into the situation: "The letter is not directed against ordinary communists. It is directed against those who want to split the party and undermine the party from within. If you don't like the party, then create your own and decide your own questions outside the bounds of the CPSU. When you carry a party card you cannot think in a totally different way to the CPSU."

Yu. Ryzhov's speech clearly did not convince the delegates, and the debate flared up with new force. Then Ye. Ligachev mounted the rostrum: This is one of the central issues in the precongress debate, and I can see nothing reprehensible in the fact that the CPSU Central Committee decided to address a letter to communists. That is very democratic.... I actually winced when one comrade here said: They provoked communists into having a

debate and now... we are starting a witch hunt... I beg you—please spare us these suspicions.

Ye. Ligachev drew the delegates' attention to the fact that organizing work to create within the party another organization, real factional activity, is under way. "We have no force except the party, the Communist Party, that is capable of extricating the country from the very complex economic and political situation. You know, I will say to you: Presidential rule is necessary, but it is not the main instrument. It is a substantial help, so to speak. But the main instrument is the party, it is communists.... And since this is the main, the most important force, it must be organized...."

Despite the fact that the member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo declared with the utmost clarity that he knows of no instance of communists being expelled for their convictions and that the Central Committee certainly did not intend to start a mass "purge" in the party, all the indications were that the delegates' alarm was not dispelled. Whatever meaning the authors attached to the letter, some speakers said, it was certainly not hard to predict the reaction of party organs at local level.

I. Yakovenko, representative of the "Democratic Platform" Coordinating Council, also spoke: "The Democratic Platform is not a party program but sets it as its task to renew the party itself... and to really put an end to dogmatism in theory, not just to pay lipservice to doing so.... In our country under five percent of communists believe that communism is the future of our development.... How much can you fool yourself? The crisis in the party is the transition to a different qualitative level. It is the transition to a party of the parliamentary type."

Judging by the figures cited by the "Democratic Platform" leaders, many communists support that viewpoint.

To the delegates' credit, they did not divide into political camps. The thought that prevailed was: "We are not trying to assess a particular platform in the appeal. We are worried above all by the methods of political struggle that may be used with the help of this letter."

So the discussion center decided by a majority of votes to refer the Leningrad draft to the congress as the main draft. Zolotov's version was passed as a minority opinion. But there was not enough time to discuss the text paragraph by paragraph.

On Saturday, at the evening plenary session, having supported the discussion center's choice, the congress vigorously got down to detailed discussion of the draft. The delegates' businesslike mood lasted only for the first two paragraphs. Then unforgivable haste over such a fundamental matter took over: The congress rapidly voted to adopt the appeal as a whole.

Was that an end to the matter? Certainly not. I. Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, took the floor. And drew attention to an error in the quotation from the letter. Now the appeal itself, adopted according to all the rules, was called into question. The audience was in confusion. It was proposed to give the ill-fated quotation accurately and in full. The congress agreed. Was that it?

Unfortunately not. Serious disagreements were brewing among delegations from the republics. Ultimatums and threats to quit the congress began to be heard.... Leningrader Vladimir Ulyanov came to the microphone and proposed taking another path. As a resolution rather a curious version was passed: Without revoking the decision on adopting the appeal as a whole, the congress set up... a conciliation commission to continue work on the document and find a version acceptable to all.

Midnight. The lights had been switched off in the auditorium. But many delegates did not leave. There were perplexed questions: Have we adopted the appeal or not? It was now quite easy to predict the result.

After working on Sunday, the conciliation commission submitted a somewhat toned down text to the congress. The congress agreed.

The earlier version was drawn up as a minority opinion....

Attacks on Lenin Show Anger Toward His Heirs

PM2504124190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Apr 90 Second Edition p 7

[Anatoliy Karpychev "View From Moscow": "Monuments and Memory: Facing the Problem"]

[Text] When you think about this subject today, you are dogged by the feeling that you are touching inflammable material. The situation, "explosion" or whatever, which resulted from it is sometimes painful in the extreme. But when you think about it more calmly—we ourselves have internalized the disease with our surprising attitude to remembrance. We believed that the more there is of it on the squares, the better. It turned out otherwise.

Almost every day letters arrive at the editorial office from readers who are indignant at the rough treatment of monuments to Lenin in Poland and Romania. The letters contain questions: How dare they, how can they, especially in allied countries, among friends?

Honestly, it is as if the world had been "turn upside down...." The virus of anticommunism has emerged among those who are "our friends" and is multiplying (recently, as you know, a Prague prosecutor demanded that the Czechoslovak Communist Party be declared illegal), and those who are "not our friends" have been fired with sympathy for perestroyka. So when I reread questions to the editorial office written, it seems to me, in the same handwriting, with the same slant, then I am in no rush to take on the role of uninvited defender, but I do want to understand both sides. Here the advice of the wonderful Russian philosopher Nikolay Berdyayev

expressed in one of his works of the 1930's was very applicable—to make a "spiritual effort to rise above factional strife, to become dispassionate, and to see not only the lies, but also the truth of communism."

I cannot and I do not have the moral right to condemn the indignation of those who have written to the editorial office, because they are defending, if you like, the lives they have lived, and their position inspires me with sincere respect. But at the same time against the background of indignation I am trying to understand: Why did the young Poles or other young people decide to take this barbaric step? Are they really vandals, descendants of those who once sacked Rome? Certainly not. Didn't they know what they were doing? They did. Then what's going on?

I want to understand them. Evidently they want to understand us, and why we are angry and indignant. We, too, are not always understandable to others. I remember how one day some Australian parliamentarians, about 10 people, came to the editorial office. They sat opposite us and began to ask questions about the party, glasnost and... about Lenin. "Why have you made an icon out of him?" they asked. "You cite only Lenin, you refer only to Lenin, and you don't take a step without him...."

A few years ago the mere mention of the word "icon" seemed blasphemous, and listening to such a question, let alone thinking it over, was sedition.... And today I still hear the reproach from the same quarter: "You mustn't." Why? We ourselves made an icon of him. The bookshelves in bureaucrats' offices were filled with volumes of Lenin's works, but by no means all the offices' occupants looked at them, and not everyone was familiar with Lenin's ideas. For many the quotations replaced thinking, arguments, and morals. If one is absolutely honest, people did not refer to Lenin so often—the next general secretary would remove the opportunity. All this was before April 1985. We did not topple Lenin from the pedestals, but we did topple his vital essence from our minds, we made him a dogma, an icon, whatever we wanted, but not an individual, not a person.

At this point I permit myself to ask how the actions of the young people who did not like the monument to Lenin on the Krakow square differ from the actions of those who were interested not in Lenin's teaching, but primarily in the prestige of a job?

In no way.

What has happened to Lenin in certain East European countries, I think, is not an explosion of savage barbarism, but it is no accident either. To a certain degree we ourselves did a lot of harm to Lenin. We compromised his teaching. And a letter from Prague which I received in answer to an article "Difficult Answers to Simple Questions" convinced me of this once more.

The letter begins with words which, I think, are difficult to pronounce in Prague now: "Hello, dear friends!" The author is Zdenka Vlastova.

"...When your newspaper comes to our store, I read it. I read the article 'Difficult Answers.... ' I would like to answer one question as an ordinary citizen. I was born in 1951. For as long as I can remember people in our country have talked about the Soviet Union, and they said only good things. Everything bad was in the United States. I respect your heroes. I know Zoya Kosmodemyanskaya, Oleg Koshevoy, I know Pavka Korchagin. I do not agree with those who smash monuments to Lenin. I am against it. But you will understand us: For ordinary people these monuments were symbols of totalitarian power. All these years we were dependent on your country, we could not think about our fate on our own, independently."

Zdenka Vlastova loves the Russian language, loves to read Pushkin, and does not conceal this in her letter.

"... Every people has its history," she continues. "Every people has the right to know its heroes. More frequently we heard the same names: Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev.... We knew their lives in more detail that the lives of our own heroes. Is this really normal, with all due respect to those people? I very much want Soviet people to read these lines and to understand us."

A stamp with a picture of Lenin is on the envelope. It is difficult to judge whether this was accidental or not. I think not.

So, for people like Zdenka Vlastova, born 40 years ago, were the monuments a symbol of totalitarian power, of the party's monopoly on power, of the ban on heterodoxy? It is quite possible, although it is difficult to listen to the bitter truth. I am not asking how this happened. Something is clear even without questions: First the tanks were brought in, and then various monuments were erected in the squares and streets. But this could not continue indefinitely, and protest often took on ugly forms. After that we began to take offense and ask: Who has allowed this?

Political passions boiling around Lenin's personality prove only one thing—his historical significance. If someone loves him today, if he is needed today, if someone hates him today, then he lives. Lenin is higher than emotions and higher than ambitions. He is also able to defend himself today. To defend his memory, his teaching, but in open, honest debate. Unfortunately, in the past he more often had to deal with "loyal Leninists," and look what happened.

...Serious people in the West treat the figure of Lenin seriously. Even his ideological opponents. And it cannot be otherwise. Today Lenin's name is very closely connected with the ideas of perestroyka. Photographs of him are glimpsed fleetingly in Western journals, but most often with a subtext suggesting that communism has collapsed. They try to guess: Will Gorbachev turn his back on Lenin?

Hamlet's predicament comes to mind. It follows that if we are turning our backs on him, then communism's

collpase is imminent; and this means that capitalism is winning the historic battle with the socialist idea and is demonstrating its superiority.

But we are not turning our backs. Read the "Word on Lenin" by M.S. Gorbachev, President of the USSR and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, published yesterday—everything is put very clearly there.

Today our country is eperiencing huge difficulties. But difficulties still do not mean collapse. Monuments are being toppled? Monuments are still not the whole of remembrance. People get used to monuments easily and then fail to notice them. A monument can be dismantled for storage. You can't send off human memory for storage. Let us be fair and honest in our opinions on Lenin. For some he is good, for others he is evil. You can love him or not love him as the case may be. The country is not important—our own or someone else's. But you cannot fail to see the closest tie between history and his personality.

I go back in my mind to Stockholm, to the Royal Library. As is known, Lenin visited while exiled abroad. He made an entry in a reader's book—his surname in this case. I did not think that people there would remember that. When I asked the librarian about Lenin, she silently led me to the reading room and showed me a table like the one where Lenin sat at the beginning of the century. A booklet published by the library lay on this little table. I don't think anyone forced her to do this.

One more fact—a letter. Our correspondent V. Volkov sent it yesterday from Madrid. I cite it almost in full: "Dear friends, in the light of recent events whereby in certain East European countries the person of Vladimir Ilich Lenin has been the object of various kinds of attacks, the public associations of the Basque Country decided to start a campaign. This consisted in holding a series of talks about Vladimir Ilich accompanied by a showing of audiovisual materials in city districts and population centers around the country. In this connection we decided to ask everyone who could help us to provide assistance in acquiring or borrowing movies or videos about Lenin, and also books, brochures, and photographs which, in their opinion, could be of use to us in this work.

"During the campaign, in which activists from various left-wing parties united by respect for the person of Lenin have applied to participate, there will also be a collection of money, notably through the sale of lottery tickets, to procure and ship to the Basque Country the statues of Lenin removed a few weeks ago in Bucharest. We hope you will support us. [Signed] Manu Aranburu, on behalf of the 'Lenin Lives!' people's commission. Address: Comite de Empresa, Donostia municipality, San Sebastian, Igentia Calea, zip code 20003. Guipuzcoa. Basque Country, Spain."

...Sometimes it seems to me that the attacks on Lenin are a gesture to the troubled times or a desire to stress one's "ego." This epidemic will also pass. This kind of thing has happened before. I think that tomorrow the present "critics" will be ashamed.

New Health Minister Lists Sector's Priorities

PM2504132790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Interview with newly appointed USSR health minister I. Denisov by own correspondent S. Tutorskaya under "Appointments" rubric: "We Must Learn To Value Our Health"; date and place unspecified; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] As we know, I. Denisov was recently appointed USSR health minister. IZVESTIYA (No. 110) carried a short biography. Our correspondent met with the minister.

[Tutorskaya] Igor Nikolayevich, our readers are, of course, interested to know which are the main priorities you will choose for yourself as head of public health care.

[Denisov] I will begin by talking about something with which you are already familiar. As a result of the recent reorganization of the USSR Health Ministry's Fourth Main Administration, we have been given 10 of the administration's sanatoriums. Eight of them are going to be used for improving the health of women and children. Primarily the victims of Chernobyl. I hope this fact alone says something about our priorities.

Next, I am in full agreement with those who believe that doctors alone should not be made responsible for the health of society. The USSR Supreme Soviet Health Committee is currently finalizing the Law on the Protection of the People's Health. This, of course, is primarily concerned with monitoring the quality of the atmosphere, water, food, housing conditions, and working conditions. Even this brief list shows that, without the whole of society making an effort, we cannot make any serious progress in health care.

We not only have to involve enterprises in work to protect the environment, we also have to make them responsible for people's health. Our future lies with insurance-based medicine. The enterprise will contribute a certain sum for the health care and medical treatment of its work force. But for the working people themselves this will mainly be free of charge. Incidentally, we do already have experience of this but it has, unfortunately, been forgotten.

There is one more very important health factor. That is our ability to take care of our health and improve it. In many countries this has become a real cult. But the other extreme is true of our country: I would say we have a wasteful, scornful attitude to our own health. We have to change our way of thinking. We need more sports areas, swimming pools, and preventive medicine centers. Enterprises must still do a great deal in this respect.

[Tutorskaya] Do you have any good news for people no longer in employment: labor veterans and the elderly?

[Denisov] Concern for their health is also going to be one of the main aspects of our work. Moreover, as with children's health care, very serious attention must be devoted not only to treatment, but also to rehabilitation, convalescence, and adaptation to real living conditions. I am concerned by the phenomenon referred to among doctors as polypragmatism. By this they mean the excessive issue of prescriptions. A doctor will sometimes make 30-40 medical prescriptions and prescribe dozens of medicines for a two-month-old baby. This is partly caused by their fear of being "hauled over the coals" and by doctors' lack of protection.

We have to improve doctors' qualifications and make tougher demands on them but, at the same time, we must also remove a number of stupid restrictions and unnecessary verification procedures and enhance the prestige of doctors and nurses together with their material position. As minister I am obliged to concern myself with this.

[Tutorskaya] There are an infinite number of problems and I hope that we will return to them and talk about shortcomings....

[Denisov] ...Without respect of persons. It is my belief that if a minister is wrong about something this must be said openly. Only glasnost will allow us to make more progress. Who am I to promise you now that in a year's time everything will be fine? Especially as we are supplied with medicines and medical equipment by other departments. The situation in this respect is very serious, and the question, say, of getting supplies of the most common medicines has become a political issue....

[Tutorskaya] Perhaps readers would be interested to hear about your interests....

[Denisov] My main interest is my work. I cannot remember a single Saturday I have not worked since I was invited to join the USSR Health Ministry apparatus. As soon as I get to work I forget about everything outside it. But I do really love going to the countryside sometimes.

[Tutorskaya] Are you going to combine your new duties with your surgical work?

[Denisov] I did try that for a while, until I realized that it was impossible to serve two gods. I must be honest with myself: My job is to organize the health service and I must put all my energies into this.

Glasnost in KGB Viewed, Compared to France

90UN1558A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 16, 21 Apr-27 Apr 90 p 7

[Article by I. Prelin, KGB press bureau official, under the rubric "USSR KGB Reports and Comments": "Their Glasnost and Ours"]

[Text] An article by P. Lukyanchenko—"The KGB in French?"—was published in the No. 2 3A issue of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY. The USSR KGB press bureau reacted to this publication in a positive way. We can only welcome ARGUMENTY I FAKTY's effort at an objective comparison of various aspects of the special services of different countries inasmuch as this promotes the formation of a correct impression among the Soviet people concerning the role and place of the KGB under conditions of building a rule-of-law state. We hope that these comparisons will be in favor of the KGB on a whole number of positions.

But, first of all, it is necessary to make one clarifying point: The doors of Lubyanka opened up to journalists, including foreign journalists, not in December, as is stated in the preface to the newspaper report, but much earlier. Thus, back in May of 1989, an APN [NOVOSTI Press Agency] film crew made a documentary video film "The KGB Today" in the buildings of the KGB, and the first important interview on the activity of the KGB was given as early as August of 1988 to French writer and journalist Alain Guerain.

In general, the managers and employees of our department, in contrast with their colleagues from the DST [Directorate for Territorial Oversight], never limit the time and number of their interviews with journalists, and they do not leave unanswered any, even the most critical, question, and, indeed, they do not conceal their names. It is sufficient to mention full pages in the central Soviet newspapers, "roundtables," press conferences, and telecasts where V. Kryuchkov, F. Bobkov, G. Ageyev, V. Pirozhkov, V. Ponomarev, and others answered journalists' questions in great detail.

Now on the point of the interview with employees of the DST. First, in our opinion, it is inappropriate to compare this French special service with the KGB, because in France questions that in the USSR fall within the jurisdiction of the KGB are handled not only by the DST, but also by the RJ (administration of general information—the secret police), which, according to the admission of our French colleagues in the aforementioned ARGUMENTY I FAKTY publication, collects political, social, and economic information—that is, it monitors the situation inside the country; the DJSE (Main Administration for Foreign Security), which conducts intelligence abroad; the DSPD (Administration for the Protection and Security of Defense—military counterintelligence); and the PAF (Police for Guarding Air and Land Borders).

Thus, if you take the total strength of all of these services and compare it with the dimensions of the territory and the size of the population of the two countries, it turns out that the relative, I emphasize, the relative numerical strength of the French special services is significantly greater than the numerical strength of the KGB, and is even greater than the numerical strength of the special services of all the other Western countries.

I suppose that the readers of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY also paid attention to the high level of secrecy that exists in the DST, which conceals from the public not only its budget and number of personnel, but also the names of top-level officials. We are more open in this respect, and we are gradually increasing the level of this openness.

Second, it is said in the interview that inspection of the activity of the DST is assigned completely to the minister of internal affairs; that is, to the manager of that department of which the DST is a part, and this is a person, so to speak, who has a direct interest. As for the KGB, control over its activity is exercised by the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Defense and State Security Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR Prosecutor General, the Ministry of Finance, and party organs. It is apparent that the forms of controls that exist in our country over the activity of the KGB are much more effective than in France and in some other Western countries.

Now with respect to the decree which regulates the activity of the DST. It seems to us that its only merit is that it was published. As for the rest, it in no way reveals the functions and structure of the DST to the French public, and, what is important, those forms and methods that the DST employs in its work.

On the contrary, the draft Law on the KGB, which was developed and submitted for approval to the USSR Supreme Soviet, provides for a detailed interpretation not only of the functional duties and tasks that fall within the jurisdiction of Soviet organs of state security, but also those methods and resources that it will be permitted to employ for their fulfillment. The USSR KGB is interested more than anyone else in the publication of this law. This will make it possible once and for all to eliminate all false rumors and conjectures regarding its competence and the legality of employing one or another method of work, and not to be afraid of groundless claims on the part of the Soviet public.

FROM THE EDITOR. The next publication under our traditional rubric (which also attests to the expansion of the boundaries of glasnost in the USSR KGB) will contain new data about the fact that the relative numerical strength of chekists is lower than in France, and that the KGB has five times as many inspectors as the DST. We welcome the information contained in the article that the leaders of the USSR KGB "do not leave unanswered any, even the most critical, question." We believe that this step toward greater openness will also be appreciated by our readers who sent questions that interested them with the note on the envelope "Glasnost and the KGB." We will publish these questions and then ask the USSR KGB to respond to them.

Andreyeva Interviewed on Perestroyka

LD1904213390 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1630 GMT 19 Apr 90

[Excerpts] Let us listen to an interview Nina Andreyeva, one of the leading figures of the Soviet conservatives within the Soviet party, gave to Istvan Kulcsar who visited Leningrad.

[Begin recording] [passage omitted on Kulcsar's introduction of Andreyeva and his historical review of how she came to prominence two years ago. Scene setting of the interview which takes place in her small Leningrad apartment]

[Kulcsar] How do you assess the progress of perestroyka in the Soviet Union?

[Andreyeva, in Russian, fading into superimposed Hungarian translation] The situation in the country, as it is written a lot about, is very complex. The crisis has made inroads into all aspects of society—economy, politics, culture, ideology. It is the counterrevolutionary wing of perestroyka that is gaining the upper hand which directly threatens the basis achievements of the October Revolution.

The speeding up of the social economic development proclaimed by Gorbachev has within four years resulted in social catastrophy, an unprecedented chaos in the economy, the paralysis of the untied economic complex of the motherland, strikes, inflation, the fast decline of living standards, the impoverishment of workers, bloody national minority clashes, the faltering of the public morality, the unprecedented growth of crime.

The crisis of society has also touched the CPSU. This is the first time in the Soviet Union that the issue of disintegration of our multi-national state is raised.

[Kulcsar] How do you see Gorbachev's role in the process you have just described.?

[Andreyeva] As is known, in 1985 the entire Soviet people voted with both hands and enthusiastically for Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev because a young, energetic, cultured leader appeared who radiated strength, who said that we could not continue to live the way we did. Just about everybody agreed with this and it was this why we supported him and the idea of perestroyka, which we interpreted as the speeding up of the building of socialist society.

Unfortunately, since 1987 we must interpret Gorbachev's stance as that of a man who tries to sit on two chairs or rather between them. He does not confront those negative trends that obstruct the progress of socialism. I have to state that this is also backed by those letters I am receiving from all parts of the country which say that Mikhail Sergeyevich is no longer even a centrist by now as the intellectuals who are members of the elite claim, but that he definitely has taken up a right-wing.

opportunist stand and the leader of these forces, although he still masks his real face.

Regretfully, I must agree with those of our ideological opponents, like the American Kremlinologist (?Shabadh) who state that if Gorbachev wins, capitalism will triumph in the Soviet Union.

[Kulcsar] Has glastnost a positive aspect, in your view?

[Andreyeva] Naturally, it has positive aspects, too. In my view at the current level of civilization every man has the right to state openly what he thinks but the limitless glasnost of today leads to the disintegration of society, anarchy, and this latter is able to destroy any organization including society, too.

[Kulcsar] I have asked this because I cannot imagine that before [glasnost] a party member, or an ordinary Soviet citizen, would have been able to say things about the general secretary of the party—particularly in front of a foreign journalist—as you have just done.

[Andreyeva] You are right. In the Soviet Union, now—following the example of Western democracy—a great deal is spoken about the current general secretary in negative terms. Sometimes even our so-called democrats, too, write about things like this and uncover such alleged facts which even if one wants to put it mildly, can only be described as a slip [csusztatas].

[Kulcsar] In the Soviet Union the various parties are forming one after the other. Where will this lead, in your opinion?

[Andreyeva] In my opinion the multi-party system in itself is not necessarily a negative phenomenon. The only question is what kind of multi-party system it is. If it serves socialism then it is alright. However, in our country, in the Soviet Union, a bourgeois multi-party system is in the process of formation. By virtue of the organization of these parties, the legalization of new, nonsocialist, economic structures is in progress. In other words, the reviving bourgeoisie, whose members are the new Soviet millionaires, the representatives of the shadow economy, the underground economy, who in the past two-three decades have been robbing us, the workers and the state, this is the class which is now striving to legalize its property. In the terms of the new Soviet laws they can do this, too.

The new parties are the tools of the political self-expression of these strata. In other words, here not only social-democratic and other petty bourgeois, but explicitly big bourgeois, parties as well, are coming onto the stage here, which raises before us the danger of civil war in the Soviet Union. These parties are already speaking openly about setting up armed corps, their own armies. Therefore, one can expect clashes that will extend to big masses.

[Kulcsar] Nina Aleksandrovna, in this situation how do you see the leading role of the Communist Party, which is proclaimed to this very day?

[Andreyeva] I do not know whether in the situation that has evolved the Communist Party will be able to maintain its leading role. However, even if it does maintain it, we shall not forget that this party is being distorted before our very eyes, something which our top leaders by their attitude are bringing about. This, according to my definition, is the right-wing opportunist group of Gorbachev, Yakovlev, and Shevardnadze. This leading group, abusing the moral credit the party gained earlier, has been given the means to do what it does with impunity, in other words, to promote the dismemberment, the stunting, of our society, the restoration of capitalism.

An increasing number of people are leaving the CPSU, and they are not the dogmatists, those incapable of transformation, as claimed by the press—though there are such among them, too, but first and foremost the staunchest communists, who are not coming to terms, who cannot come to terms, with the social-democratic, petty bourgeois revisionist distortion of the CPSU. After the 28th congress, even if the CPSU remains in existence, it will in essence no longer be the party it was up to the eighties. A rift will most probably occur.

One group is organizing a social-democratic party but they are not the ones who are leaving the party today, because they expect to be able to grab a part of the party assets: printing presses, publishing enterprises, buildings.

On the other hand, those who will be incapable of staying in this social-democratic party—whose typical representative is Mikhail Gorbachev—will create their own party, the Bolshevik party. In Soviet society by now the need is ripe to create an essentially Marxist Bolshevik Party, a party standing on the basis of the dictatorship of the working class.

[Kulcsar]You have just raised the possibility of civil war in the Soviet Union.

[Andreyeva] Civil war, unfortunately, is already in progress in our country, in various regions of the country, and with varying degrees of intensity. This war is already blazing in the Caucasus and in essence it has already started in the Baltics as well. In Moldavia events have not yet reached the level we can call civil war.

In the history of mankind there has not been a single statesman, leader or ruler who destroyed his own empire with his own hands. On the contrary, every king, president, strove rather to conquer foreign territories. Today in the Soviet Union we can be witness to a reverse process. Our big power is breaking up into some kind of small, feudal, petty monarchies, each with its own economy, self- accounting. We do not even mind if anyone secedes from the state. Our leaders are managing to achieve something that even Hitler's fascist hordes did not manage to do, although he was a talented war lord, and the whole of Europe supported him in subjugating the Soviet Union. For this reason, Mikhail Sergeyevich

Gorbachev and his group can expect stormy applause from our ideological opponents. [passage omitted]

The article that appeared in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA did indeed change my life to a significant extent. Since then I have been getting a huge number of letters. Together with me many people have taken a stand against the counterrevolutionary nature of perestroyka. This has raised the question of union. Last May in Moscow we founded the Yedinstvo, Unity, in Hungarian, the society struggling for Leninism and Communism, whose president I became. This month we will hold the second national conference, where we will decide how we want to continue to function. It is possible that we will become a party; we will be the kernel of Bolshevization. But this will not be easy, because we have no printing press, nobody finances us, there are no cooperatives sponsoring us. But it is also possible that alongside the new party, the Bolshevik party, we will also maintain our society, which will be as it were a reserve of the party, and its members, as it were, candidate members of the party. We will decide these issues at our forthcoming conference, and moreover, with a collective decision, because with us there is no Bonapartism.

Not for one minute have I regretted publishing that particular article, because with that I helped to uncover the political games of Gorbachev and the handy-men of restructuring. At our first national conference the delegates of 26 Soviet cities, republics, were present. Now there will be more of us. Our local committees are being formed countrywide. Our movement is spreading with the rapidity of a chain reaction, particularly among the youth and the humanist intelligentsia. We are not many, it is true, but there are sufficient of us for solving certain problems. We have to be clear about the fact that our own future, the future of our children, grandchildren, is in our hands. We will not give away our socialism just like that, even if it is somewhat distorted. For this reason the question today is: socialism or death. [end recording]

Poverty Seen as Means of State Control

PM2004152090 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 19 Apr 90 p 2

[Aleksandr Lapin article: "Poverty: Social Portrait of a Phenomenon"]

[Text] Valentin Sergeyevich D. had dreamed of a car all his life. His loving family put money aside for it month after month, year after year. He himself spent five years in the waiting line at work.

Then, quite recently, the dream came true. A brand new "Mark 8" was installed in the garage. It immediately became a great favorite. Valentin Sergeyevich's wife cosseted the car. He himself kept a careful eye on it.

But two weeks ago, disaster struck. Driving into the garage, Valentin Sergeyevich miscalculated slightly. And caught the bodywork on a hook. As a result a long scratch was gouged out of the polished surface. Pale, his teeth chattering, he could barely make it from the garage to the house. That night he became very sick. An ambulance took him to hospital. And in the morning his wife learned that he had died of a heart attack.

That is one story. Not the worst in our mail. Thousands of people write in. Old men and women, newlyweds and single mothers. All the letters make the same point. They are about poverty, as a result of which the contemporary Soviet person, having worked all his life, comes to resemble the hero of Gogol's "The Overcoat." The only difference is that at the end of the 20th century, for Valentin Sergeyevich, for instance, the role of the symbol of prosperity [the overcoat in Gogol's story] and the meaning of life is played by a tin box on four wheels. A box which people in the developed countries change as easily as we change our jacket.

How widespread is this misfortune in our country, which has built "developed socialism?"

Before trying to answer that question I consulted many sources. But not one of them provided a conclusive answer. Some say that 36 million people are below the poverty line, others—40 million, others again—70 million.

But let us look at poverty not from the viewpoint of our own internal, very modest ideas, but from the standpoint of the developed states among which we count ourselves.

What is sufficiency, in their interpretation?

It includes, as a minimum, your own house or large apartment, one or two cars per family, a full set of furniture and household equipment. Clothes which are changed every season. A summer vacation. The possibility of playing sport. Good nutrition with plentiful protein and vitamins, services, and so forth. In the developed world all this is usually defined by one covering term—quality of life. **And if you compare this quality of life, we must admit, hands on hearts, that from the viewpoint of a developed, civilized society the vast majority of our country's population live below the poverty line.**

Incidentally, objective data indicate the same thing. In terms of the level of personal consumption per head of population, the Soviet Union ranks 77th in the world. Immediately below South Africa and above Romania.

I remember from my school days the pictures in the history textbooks. Barge haulers pulling a barge. Peasants begging for alms. The family breadwinner dying. Prerevolutionary Russia appears to its descendants as hungry, poor, and dirty. But was all that really so? In order to find out, we must discard the false myths created by our own propaganda. These were needed in order more vividly to highlight the achievements of a people following the path of building Stalinist barracks socialism. But what was the real situation?

The 17th century. Foreigners write: "In Moscow there are plentiful supplies of all the things necessary for life, comfort, and luxury, and moreover you can buy them at a reasonable price...."

But in those days the powers of the time knew very well how the impoverishment of the masses could threaten them. And they took certain measures to control the standard of living. All her life, Catherine II used to begin the morning by listening to the report of the St. Petersburg chief of police. He reported on the prices at the city's markets. If they had gone up, she adopted tough measures.

So how should we look at the evidence of poverty and indigence depicted so plentifully in our schoolbooks? Such as Aleksandr Radishchev's celebrated [18th century] work, "A Journey From St. Petersburg to Moscow." Are they not to be believed? I think here we should adopt the principle: Trust, but verify. For instance, not many people know that A.S. Pushkin, in his day, made the same journey as Radishchev, and left us his work "A Journey From Moscow to St. Petersburg." Comparing his impressions with the book, Pushkin totally demolished his predecessor's arguments. Here, for instance, is what he says about the fate of the Russian peasant. "There is no one in Russia who does not have his **own** dwelling. The beggar setting off to wander the world leaves **his own hut** behind. This does not happen in other countries. Everywhere in Europe, owning a cow is a sign of luxury: In our country, not to own a cow is a sign of terrible poverty."

It is even more difficult to fit to the propaganda pattern what was happening in Russia at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th. Fortunately a great many statistics survive from those times, providing objective evidence against the myth created by our propaganda. They cannot all be cited in a short newspaper article. Let us just take a few. Academician S.G. Strumilin, examining the national [narodnyy] wealth in Russia in that period, demonstrates that in this respect, by the beginning of World War I, the country ranked third in the world! And in terms of economic growth rates, at first it ranked second after the United States, and later it overtook it.

Today, when we discuss the population's prosperity, we use concepts like per capita consumption. At the beginning of the century this was called national income per inhabitant. And here we ranked seventh in the world. (Compare that with today's 77th.)

The country knew how to value those who contributed to progress. Whereas a worker's average annual wage was about R300 (an average of 27 kopeks a day went on food), the wage for technical personnel was around R1,500. And for managers—R6,000.

Curious details about Russian people's food can be discovered even in such sources as the standard ration in the years of World War I. For instance, in 1915 each inhabitant of St. Petersburg was allowed 200 grams of meat a day. Don't be lazy, work out how much that comes to per month and per year.

I think these facts speak for themselves. Russia was not a poor country. Of course, prosperity for the people was a long way off. But the living standard was certainly comparable with the living standard in other countries.

There is no need to describe what happened to the national economy during World War I, the reovlution, and then the Civil War. Enough has been written about this.

The NEP [new economic policy], with its market system and enterprise, gave people the opportunity to breathe more freely. I will cite just two instances. In 1927 in the USSR meat consumption per head of population was about 127 kg. Incidentally, the United States has that level of consumption today.

The country had once again become a major grain exporter. But these were our last achievements to serve the people.

From the early thirties the powers of the time set a new course. Its essence was as follows. **It was decided to build the wealth and might of the state not on the wealth of the people, as was done in other countries, but on their poverty.** Industrialization was the turning point here.

In order to build and equip plants, currency was needed. There was no way to obtain it. The only source was grain sales abroad. But grain was in the hands of the individual peasant. He was not giving it away for nothing. It had to be taken away.

With collectivization, the main aim was achieved—to take grain, livestock, and tools from the individual peasant. Poverty became our way of life.

True, in N.S. Khrushchev's era some attempts were made to improve the situation. But probably all that remains of that era is the famous five-story apartment blocks and fine-sounding slogans.

It must be admitted that by the early seventies the Soviet people's prosperity had increased. But the basis of this growth was not our own production, but the move toward selling our national natural wealth—oil, gas, coal, forests. In exchange we bought from abroad consumer goods and new machines for extracting that same coal, oil, and gas. Now that raw materials prices have fallen, this source has dried up. And we are back where we started as regards consumer goods.

As we work, so shall we live!—claim the representatives of the administrative edict system to explain our poverty. I would venture to assert that this statement is false and offensive to the people, who wore themselves out building the Dneproges and Magnitka with their own hands and doing their own plowing after the war. That is not the point. **Ever since the thirties, an economic mechanism for the reproduction of poverty has operated in the country. The result of its activity is as follows. However**

much a person works and however hard, he will not live in wealth or ease. The fate of thousands of pensioners who send us despairing letters are graphic evidence of this.

What kind of mechanism is this? What principles govern its activity?

The State Committee for Statistics asserts that the Soviet Union ranks first in the world in terms of steel smelting, oil extraction, and the production of tractors, metal-cutting machine tools, tanks, missiles, and so forth. Yet we lag far behind the developed countries in the production of cars, radio equipment, furniture, food products.... The percentage relationship here is as follows. Throughout the world, where market relations operate, production of the means of production accounts for about one-fourth of all industrial output. The remaining three-fourths are consumer goods. In our country, the opposite is true. **That is, the cannibalistic economy works not for people, but for itself. Labor and resources are in effect used for nothing, pointlessly. The very structure of production, created artificially, generates approximately a threefold lag in consumption!**

There are also other causes of poverty which substantially lower the level of consumption. For instance, what proportion of what is earned do we actually receive? Some economists assert that the labor remuneration fund in our country is about 20 percent. Others put it at 35-40 percent. The State Committee for Statistics claims that it is 48. But they all agree on one point. Namely, that in any event it is lower than in the developed countries. So it turns out that the capitalist takes less added value from the worker than our own socialist state does.

Labor remuneration principles based on leveling and extortion are the second channel by which poverty is maintained.

In 1987 Siberia sociologists carried out a very interesting study of the distribution of income among various population groups. They discovered a very curious law. "High-ranking leaders and high-paid specialists also have priority when it comes to receiving various kinds of assistance, services, and benefits from their enterprise and from society." I remember this conclusion when I hear people talking about social consumption funds.

The conclusion is simple. **What happens through our present social consumption funds is not a process of evening out social wealth, but its redistribution in favor of those who are in power.**

K. Marx himself, in his instructions to delegates of the Provisional Central Council... wrote: "...we recommend **the total abolition of indirect taxes and their general replacement with direct taxes;**

"...Because indirect taxes conceal from each individual the sum that he pays to the state... direct taxes... encourage everyone to monitor the government, whereas indirect taxes suppress all desire for self-government."

As you know, our state has taken the second path. Our income tax is comparatively small. But as for indirect taxation! A bottle of vodka costs the buyer R10. Out of that, R9.70 is indirect taxation. Cars, television sets, furniture, and many other things are sold at several times the prime cost.

So let us admit that indirect taxes on consumer goods rob our budget of what was left.

Two weeks ago a friend of mine bought some boots. Yesterday he was forced to throw them away, because they were totally useless for further wear. But this event, which is commonplace for Soviet people, has not only a tragic significance, but an economic significance, too. **The poor quality of output produced is another channel for robbing the people.**

Last year the USSR State Budget was discussed widely by people's deputies for the first time. We heard every conceivable proposal at the congress. The people's elected representatives, you could say, were looking with a magnifying glass for the billion rubles needed for priority pension increases. But no one dared to ask the government to give an account of what is meant by one item in its expenditure, namely, "financing of foreign trade and expenditure on state banking and commercial operations, nonrepayable aid to foreign states, and other expenditure relating to international ties." Yet a considerable sum is allocated to this item in the budget—R26,421,862,000. What is this trade that, far from bringing revenue, actually requires 26 million in subsidies? It is trade that takes place at our expense and is aimed at maintaining the existence of regimes that are ideologically close to us and cannot feed themselves. It is trade with "fraternal countries" in our oil, timber, and gas, at giveaway prices. It is money given in the form of a nonrepayable debt, which has already reached the astronomical figure of 85 billion currency rubles. **It is robbery in the guise of foreign trade and foreign policy activity.**

As a result the ordinary citizen constantly receives the necessities of life at a level only just above the physiological minimum. And in places, below it. As for talking about the pressure exerted on the market by the R300 billion in savings—that is not an indication of our wealth. It is simply evidence of the impoverished nature of the market.

But sometimes, especially at critical moments in history, when even this powerful mechanism aimed at maintaining the population in poverty stutters, then we begin to see outright—not veiled—robbery. Usually, monetary reforms are used for this purpose. I will not touch on the postrevolutionary and postwar reforms. They could not be typical. But the 1961 reform can be regarded as classical in this respect.

The level of poverty that had gradually been achieved was enshrined in legislation in our country. Acts were adopted specifically limiting the right of personal ownership. Here are some examples. By law, a Soviet citizen

can only have one home. On receiving a legacy from abroad he is obliged to hand over a significant proportion of it to the state. Therefore, many people, in such cases, simply prefer to leave.

Did this all-embracing mechanism arise of its own accord, or was it deliberately constructed in accordance with the regime's ideology?

Virtually all the revolutionaries, beginning with K. Marx, the originator of the theory of dictatorship of the proletariat, paid tribute to the ideas of noneconomic coercion. V.I. Lenin vigorously put these ideas into practice at the time of war communism. L. Trotskiy dreamed of forming labor armies. But Lenin was able to grasp the futility of this path, and renounced it. Stalin, however, remained true to it. His train of thought was logical. The NEP had created—albeit on a smaller scale than before the revolution—a class of property-owners. NEP speculators, small traders, holders of concessions, individual peasants—all these people were almost independent of the state machine. The basis of their independence was the economy. Such people could not be made to build barracks socialism. Furthermore the emergence of sensible, autonomous bosses in the country was a constant threat to the regime. After all, it needed the negligible man, the mere cog. But Stalin understood very well also that leveling is detrimental to the economy. He said: "Leveling has nothing in common with Marxist socialism."

But the dilemma was this: either make your own power absolute, or, in time, when the NEP has developed, lose the monopoly over it. We know which course was chosen. The peasants were the last property-owning class. When the ground was snatched from under their feet, too, not a single person remained in the country who was independent of the state.

The loss of property and the deterioration in the masses' material position quickly affected the people's morality and their social consciousness. Furthermore, massive ideological indoctrination played a part. It was instilled into people that they must tighten their belts and sacrifice the present for the sake of a bright future. The movies and books of those years glorified poverty, hammering home the naive idea: 90US0796B The poor are good, right-thinking people, while those who are comfortably off or—heaven forbid—rich, are bad people and loathsome. Those prerevolutionary works whose heroes are self-sacrificing people were propagandized.

Furthermore poverty and its constant companion, shortages, were of purely practical importance for the authorities, too. With their help the people were placed outside politics. After all, our people's heads are always full—with looking for meat, sausages, furniture, sugar coupons. They have no time for politics, no time for philosophy.

It is also easier to manipulate the minds of the poor. If you have taken everything away from someone, you can sometimes do him a favor. Increase his wages, reduce prices. Even today we hear many people of the older generation say: "In Stalin's time prices used to go down, but what happens now?"

As a result of all these measures we have gradually become a lumpen-people, ready to follow our leaders [vozhdi] equally to a bright future, to a totalitarian hell, or to make war on our neighbors. Such characteristics as envy and hatred of more fortunate people have become widespread.

But nature, as you know, abhors a vacuum. If there are poor people, but no rich people, their place must be filled without fail. By whom? In our country the state is rich. But since that concept is too vague, we try to give it more concrete form. For the people, the state is today personified by its civil servant representatives. Their main function is the control and management of social property and the distribution of the wealth created by the people. Can these distributors be called a class? Let us go back to Lenin: "Classes are groups of people one of which can appropriate another's labor because of their different places in the established structure of the social economy."

You could hardly put it better than that. And if we measure Lenin's classical definition point by point against the present-day position of the civil servants, we will have to admit, like it or not: Today they occupy the place of the ruling class. Naturally, they make use of their right to dispose of public property. It may be true that the wealth of this new class is only relative, by Western standards. That is not the point. **The point is that it appropriates a proportion of the social product that is disproportionately large in relation to its own contribution, thereby exacerbating the position of its fellow citizens.** All these personal privileges have not been earned.

Is there a way out of humiliating poverty? Now that the whole country is grappling with this question, many people seek the solution in a return to classical capitalism. Here they ignore the fact that it has long since ceased to exist. And radical changes have taken place within the capitalist society.

Classical Marxist-Leninist writers agreed that the main condition necessary for the new system's victory is to ensure a higher level of labor productivity. Here it was implied that the new owners of the enterprises—proletarians with property, working not from fear, but from conscience—will ensure that growth. But in our country the proletarians did not become the owners of the means of production. As a result we lost the most important argument with capitalism. Furthermore we did not even notice how, under classical capitalism, having reached a peak of productivity, in order to further increase it they started to use purely socialist incentives. For instance, the number of large firms and enterprises in the world that are owned and managed on the basis of private ownership is falling. They are proving less efficient than enterprises whose owners are the workers themselves.

I think we should not turn back, but go in the direction in which the whole world is moving. The law on ownership that has now been adopted offers this opportunity. Only by giving it real meaning, only through perestroyka and the creation of a market system will we ultimately be able to achieve prosperity for ourselves and our children.

But if the people are to get rich, they must have the most important thing—economic freedom. Becuase only freedom offers the opportunity to awaken latent forces, talents, activeness. Only free labor can work economic miracles. One now famous writer wrote in his book that he **used to think that freedom is freedom of speech, the press, and conscience. But freedom is the whole of life, all people. This is what it is: You have the right to sow what you like, make shoes and coats, bake bread from the grain you sowed, sell it or not, as you like, whether you are a fitter, a steel worker, or an artist, live and work as you wish: and not as you are told!**

Planned Contracts for Internal Troops Explained

PM0904094990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Interview with Lieutenant General B. Smyslov, first deputy commander of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Troops, by S. Mostovshchikov under the rubric "From Authoritative Sources": "Internal Troops: Service on Contract;" date, place of interview not given]

[Text] The USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Troops have been given the right to recruit inducted soldiers and sergeants for their subunits on a voluntary basis. They will have contracts and will receive pay. An IZVESTIYA correspondent asked Lieutenant General B. Smyslov, first deputy commander of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Troops, to give the details.

[Smyslov] First of all, I must say that we are doing a pretty good job of training soldiers for guard duty and servicemen for special forces. So we are perfectly entitled to call ourselves "professional troops." Hired troops are another matter, involving a specific acquisition principle.

The way inducted soldiers and sergeants are recruited into our forces does not entirely suit us. Tasks have changed and operational units are having to be constantly moved from one end of the country to the other. They need to be highly mobile, very responsible, and better skilled.

Therefore the internal affairs minister has set the task of elaborating proposals on altering the principle of internal troops manpower acquisition. We have studied practices abroad and have used anything that might be of use in this country.

[Mostovshchikov] What elements of our own practice turned out to be of use?

[Smyslov] There already exist subunits that are entirely made up of warrant officers. They guard important state facilities. There are people in them who have done several years' service, they receive pay, and they know their job inside out. This experience merits attention, although it needs further work done on it.

In fact, there are minuses as well as all the pluses. These units are immobile and inefficient. The warrant officers live in apartments (if they can be provided, of course) in various parts of the cities and they all have families and children. Ideally, what you need to implement very specific tasks is soldiers living in barracks or hostels who can be assembled in a matter of minutes. This is where the contract system will help.

[Mostovshchikov] What does the contract consist of?

[Smyslov] We intend to have a three-year contract. Either a conscript or a soldier or sergeant who has already been inducted can sign a contract. A serviceman who signs such a document is obliged to undergo more serious training in his military specialty.

[Mostovshchikov] A contract is a document in which all the parties concluding it make commitments. A man promises to serve for three years, so what is he promised?

[Smyslov] The actual payment has not been set yet. We intend to have a system whereby it increases depending on the term of service and the quality of service. By the end of the third year the "contractors" will be paid nearly as much as a warrant officer—around R200.

These servicemen will be granted permission to go on leave from their units wearing civilian clothes and will be provided with more comfortable accommodations. We have selected four regiments carrying out different functions and we intend to carry out an experiment with them.

[Mostovshchikov] When will it start?

[Smyslov] It will take time to find the resources.

Journalists Give Emoluments to Chernobyl Fund

PM1904144390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Apr 90 Second Edition p1

[Unattributed announcement concerning 19 April issue of PRAVDA]

[Text] All-Union Charity Week is now upon us. Today's issue consists mainly of readers' letters and material written on the basis of such letters. The PRAVDA journalists and authors of this material taking part in Charity Week have decided to donate the emoluments to the fund set up to help the victims of Chernobyl.

Contents of Latest Issue of KOMMUNIST Reported

PM2004095390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Apr 90 First Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Latest Issue of Journal"]

[Text] The sixth issue of KOMMUNIST opens with the CPSU Central Committee resolution "On the Newspaper PRAVDA." In the article "Perestroyka Is Our Democratic Revolution" E. Arab-ogly ponders the historical lawfulness of the October Revolution and our current tasks. Topical issues concerning interethnic relations are discussed in the article "Lenin, Federalism, and Our Time" by E. Tadevosyan. "The Ideology of Renewal: Realism of Thought and Action" is the title of the article by A. Kapto, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Ideology Department.

The articles by Doctor of Historical Sciences A. Mertsalov and movie scriptwriter S. Freylikh are pegged to the anniversary of our victory.

A. Arbatov speaks out against speculation on concepts that are dear to everyone: in particular, concepts such as independence. To dispel the highly widespread delusion that monetary reform is a panacea for all our economic ills is the aim of the article by Yu. Aksenov and A. Ulyukayev. An article by F. Prokopov and N. Rogovskiy is carried under the title "Employment We Need."

"In the coming years, CEMA has to become a kind of business club where interested partners will be able to reach agreement on cooperation," O. Rybakov believes; his article is carried under the rubric "The World Today: Trends and Contradictions."

The journal is still publishing responses to a precongress questionnaire. The rubric "Notes in the Margin" is represented by a rejoinder to an article in VOYENNO-ISTORICHESKIY ZHURNAL.

The journal also publishes an article by V. Leybin entitled "Problems of Alienation Through the Prism of Perestroyka," and a review by I. Dedkov of A.N. Yakovlev's book "Realism Is the Territory of Perestroyka."

Economics

Gorbachev Aide Ponders Economic Reform

PM2504095990 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 24 Apr 90 pp 1, 2

[Interview with N.Ya. Petrakov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and aide to the president of the USSR on economic problems, "prepared for press," by V. Badov and A. Sokolov; no place or date of interview given: "Take It Easy With the Shock Treatment!"]

[Text] [RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] The idea of radicalizing the economic reform ran clearly through M.S. Gorbachev's speech at the Presidential Council's first sitting. How would you, as the president's economic adviser, explain this thesis?

[Petrakov] The economy has always been our society's sore spot, but its problems are getting worse now. As you may recall, Mikhail Sergeyevich said that we must solve the problem of building market relations in the economy without any fears or inhibitions. Ideological barriers have been demolished in this sense, but how should the building proceed? There have been sufficiently serious and heated arguments about this. Moreover, they were neither academic nor soapbox arguments, they actually were businesslike. Following a long period of halfhearted measures, the time for decisive steps has come. I would define that which is happening today as a brainstorming session ahead of a crucial choice. The economy's state of crisis no longer allows us to pursue the path of halfhearted measures. Ideas drawn from the Polish experience are being promoted with sufficient persistence today. Many of our economists have been profoundly impressed by Mazowiecki's reform. The Polish example has produced tough market measures known as shock treatment. For how long can we put up with halfhearted solutions, some people in our country say, let us get up and do what the Poles have done. There is some sort of reason behind this. What puts me on my guard, however, is the fact that people who were rather skeptical about the market in general for quite a long time have suddenly turned out to be such "superradicals." They may not have been altogether negative about it, but were certainly extremely cautious. It seems to me that such a reversal in thinking—I do not think it is timeserving, that would be putting too strongly—smacks of a gesture of despair. When everything in the economy is tumbling down, some of the "newly hatched" advocates of market shock treatment for the sick economy are ready to make a volte-face and jump in at "the deep end." Such a metamorphosis automatically makes you pause and ponder.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] As far as we know, Nikolay Yakovlevich, your position is different.

[Petrakov] Yes, I was professionally working on market structures even at the time when such work was being persecuted [presledovalas], and market socialism was a downright insulting term. And I would like to give a warning: Take it easy with the shock treatment! First, to begin with, it is necessary to soberly weigh its political aspect, and only then its economic aspect. Politically, the situation in Poland is substantially different from ours. The Poles strove for "Solidarity" to come to power and now, to all intents and purposes, they have nobody to grumble at. Economically, they have now got what they wanted and the Mazowiecki government's program—even though it might be a bitter pill—is being implemented on the basis of this social consensus. As for our country, the situation in society now is completely different. Too many figures have climbed on the political stage, having ridden the wave of populism into the Supreme Soviet and the upcoming Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputies. A very vociferous and populist line is also pursued by our trade unions which date back to the times of stagnation and which, having suffered a serious defeat during the miners' strikes last summer, now want to accumulate political capital at the cost of socioeconomic

demagoguery. I believe that this gravely complicates the political context of economic reform. Here we come up against obstructions blocking the market path of development; this time, however, they are erected not by ministries' apparatus but by politicians who are playing on the masses' moods.

Let us look at the social or, to put it better, the daily life aspect. The Poles are accustomed to living with quite fast growth of retail prices. When Mazowiecki introduced free prices, they increased severalfold. But the price index in Poland increased 1,430 percent between 1985 and 1989! The Poles now have steady [ravnovesnyye] prices, goods are freely stacked on the shelves, and inflation has dropped.

The Poles, accustomed to inflation as an inevitable evil, are not driven to despair by Mazowiecki's tough measures. It is perfectly obvious that Poles find it easier to accept high prices than empty shelves. But all sociological studies in our country indicate the exact opposite. People will accept rationing and waiting in line, especially during working hours, as long as prices do not rise. A small proportion, approximately 30 percent, support market orientation and believe that even higher prices are acceptable as long as goods reappear on the shelves.

Prejudices against market relations are deep rooted in people's minds, and this has had an effect on attitudes toward cooperatives. The government is introducing restrictions on the cooperative movement under pressure from the population which, in its simplicity, rejects this market orientation. People in our country are unable to grasp that if a cooperative member's goods are expensive, abuse should be heaped not on the cooperative member but on our state trade system and our light industry. Why is it that similar goods are unavailable in stores at lower prices? Oh no, the cooperative member is to blame because he, the wretch, is charging very high prices. This political and sociopsychological background, this tight grip of prejudice, must be soberly appraised. The option of transition to a "Mazowiecki style" market bodes nothing good. It is not worth tempting fate. From the economic viewpoint, such an approach is very primitive. Our "new marketeers" say: Let us introduce free prices and give enterprises a free hand. And everything, they claim, will work out. Fine, we may have to go through a bout of fever, but the economic organism will recover afterwards and everything will be fine. The point is that we were already close to the point of doing so. We tried to give enterprises a free hand. The curious point is that many of them voluntarily reneged from autonomy in the belief that the state would do away with "satisfying" their raw and other material and equipment requirements from central stocks. And they immediately sought cover beneath the umbrella of state orders. Just give us state orders, they said, and we need no autonomy at all. On the other hand, our monopoly producers hiked their prices as soon as they gained autonomy. Therefore, before talking about free prices, it is necessary to realize that they can really "promote" the rationalization of economic behavior only in the event of honest competition. Free prices in monopoly conditions are just nonsense.

Let us take an unblinkered look at what is happening in our industry. We will see that it is ruled by supermonopoly. I perceive two categories of monopoly in our country. The organizational category of monopoly includes sector ministries and the largest associations which create a situation whereby consumers have to deal not with an individual enterprise but with a ministry which looks no further than its own interest. Aeroflot and Intourist are typical organizational monopolies. Political will is needed to eliminate this category of monopolies.

I think that there is no need to delay the adoption of a law, or maybe a presidential decree, on the transfer of our state industry to joint stock forms of existence. We have wrongly forgotten about them. And yet they represent a real socialization of production in a sufficiently flexible form. What is a joint stock corporation? Shares can be owned by private individuals, in other words workers at that enterprise. Any working person can invest his money in shares instead of just depositing it with the Savings Bank. Mafia members can be prevented from becoming investors by demanding that they submit income declarations. People who purchase shares channel their funds into the development of some sector or another. This is a process of investment pluralism. Shares can also be purchased by cooperatives, joint enterprises, our own banks, and even—in principle—other countries' banks. Incidentally, the easiest way to set up joint enterprises is through joint stock forms. It is easier to regulate the amount of capital and the controlling package of shares. This is a very flexible form of joint management. The founding members or the shareholders' council appoint the enterprise's director and administration. Everything is under their control: dividends, profits, profitability.... This is also a different step toward self-management without any so-called superior links.

The superior link represents the need, stemming from our feudal thinking, to unfailingly build pyramids. It is sufficient to come under the tax department, the way it is done all over the world. The Ministry of Finance is not a "superior organization." It cannot dismiss an enterprise's director, berate him, or impose a huge state order on him. But the Ministry of Finance can—as we see for ourselves now—use taxes to either suffocate an enterprise or, in contrast, give it room to breathe. But we are already talking about a fundamentally different kind of management—using economic levers.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] But are we not pinning too great a hope on joint stock structures?

[Petrakov] I am not saying that the joint stock form is a panacea against all evils. Sundry forms of small and medium enterprises must be set up from below. This is a very important question, because the second category of monopoly is the technological. This is our notorious

gigantomania. We always believed that a large plant is unfailingly better than a medium or a small one. We artificially bred monopolists. It is impossible to break apart an industrial giant which has already been built. This means that it will remain a technological monopolist for a long time to come. If some plant in Armenia comes to a standstill, we have to spend foreign currency because the country has no other producers of similar output. There are many such examples. There are, fortunately, not so many in the light and food industries. It is easier to organize competition there. But when talking about heavy industry, it is chock full with such monster monopoly producers. It is impossible to talk about any competition there. It will be necessary to introduce price controls and antimonopoly legislation.

There is another aspect to be considered when introducing the market. It is the fact that there are massive amounts of money in the population's hands. Some people describe deferred demand as "superfluous" or surplus money. No matter how you describe it, none of us has any surplus money. This is money which has failed to find any goods. People are putting it aside for "emergencies," for the purchase of consumer durables, for holiday travel. This is what is known as normal savings. In addition, our economy also has enforced savings.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] To how many billion does this money "stretch?"

[Petrakov] A number of specialists estimate the amount at R165 billion. This represents a real avalanche of bank notes hanging above our heads. Why has it developed? Because the state always proclaimed that price control is the best method to combat inflation. Prices were held on a tight leash while income control slackened. Money incomes were boosted by crazy capital investments and dubious projects with long completion schedules. Supernormative "work in progress" increased by R39 billion in 1989. R8-9 billion of that amount represented construction industry workers' net wages unaccounted for by any material production. They received money without building anything. Nothing but pieces of paper. Incomes rise swiftly and prices rise slowly, year in and year out. If prices were to be "let loose" then, under the law of communicating vessels, the entire amount of R165 billion would produce a price leap. The entire amount of deferred demand will enter the market. In order to prevent a price leap, something must be done about these R165 billion. The populists have a very simple answer: This money must be seized!

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] It is easy to say—seized. But how?

[Petrakov] Precisely. But the populists proceed from this premise: Almost the entire amount is in the shadow economy, in the hands of our mafia members. Therefore, if we were to confiscate it, the people would "hardly" suffer. Prove to us, they say, where you got all this money and you will not lose anything. A modern-day fairy story! It seems to me that such a manipulation with seizure of money will produce a "catch" of no more than R3-4 billion. This surplus money seems to be spread around. Deposits in excess of R25,000, and even in excess of R10,000, account for only 1.5 percent of the total amount. And I consider deposits of up to R10,000 to be normal. We will not seize anything, and will only hurt the people's feelings.

I agree with Abalkin when he talks about the ineradicable itch to share out. But even that is not the point. The misfortune is that this will hardly even scratch the mafia. The mafia will convert the rubles which are losing their purchasing power into valuables, foreign currency, and real estate. We will hardly "expropriate" anything by the method of confiscation proposed by economist Sergeyev. It is necessary to find methods to generate interest in putting the enforced savings to work. How? Only 15 percent of housing in our cities is cooperatively owned now, the rest is state owned. Maybe these percentages should be reversed? Maybe free apartments should be available only to people on low incomes?

There is another aspect which I consider very important. Adopt a system whereby enterprises pay for the apartments of people "in line" on low incomes, but only using their material incentive funds. This would be similar to the health care system in the West, when you pay the full cost of a physician's services. You then go either to the insurance company or to your trade union and recover either 100 percent or 70 percent of the amount. To give up free housing provided by the state, in its depersonalized sense, I imagine that it is necessary to more quickly raise savings account interest rates, especially for long-term deposits. If someone agrees not to withdraw the money from his account for five or seven years, let him earn eight or 10 percent. After all, given the current rate of inflation—7.5 percent—people would lose out if they kept their money in savings accounts.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] But are our ordinary bank structures prepared for this?

[Petrakov] Of course, we need to substantially change our banking system as well. This is the third condition of the transition to market economy. We seemed to have taken the line of breaking our banking system into smaller units. The only achievement was to increase the number of positions for our bankers. Not a single serious step was taken in the sphere of interest rate policy. What should our bankers worry about? The most effective utilization of capital. Who would pay high interest rates on loans? In other words, to distribute capital investment on the basis of efficiency rather than Gosplan [State Planning Committee] "quota." Projects in the social sphere would be the exception. The state budget ought to take on nationwide social programs. This would apply to major science and technology programs, space, defense. All the rest ought to be financed through bank loans.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] Yes, but banks should also be given autonomy.

[Petrakov] Having opted for a modern market economy, the emission bank should inevitably be taken away from government subordination. After all, we have to all intents and purposes lost the financial counterweight to government programs. From the purely legal point of view, if the emission bank chairman is a member of the government he cannot go against the government by saying that there is no money for the latest ambitious project. Look for it wherever you like. If you need money really badly, then it is up to you, arrange for a credit line from the West, raise taxes, but the national economy has no money. But since he cannot say this to the premier, it means that we are again resorting to the printing press.

The emission of "hot" money reached R18 billion last year. The government requested from the Supreme Soviet an emission of R10 billion for 1990. The Supreme Soviet consented. I think that this is a terrible step. It is nothing but plugging the gap with money that is not accounted for by goods. After all, if you have properly produced your output, sold it, and need to pay wages, you should not need any emission. Pay the workers from whatever you have earned. Emission comes to "the rescue" only when the output produced is unneeded and inefficient, when market processes are being constrained. And since you are actually making an official request for such an emission, this means that you are not confident that the national economy is developing on a healthy basis.

Now we must ask ourselves: Should the market be introduced by means of a package of simultaneous measures or on "deferred" terms? Abalkin's previous program was built on stages. I believe that the maneuver of transition to the market should be effected through a tightly scheduled "package" of measures. Not by introducing joint stock corporations today, with bank reform to follow in a year or 18 months' time. Nothing good will come of it. There is, however, a precondition: Disperse these R165 billion which are hanging like a weight around our neck. Then we could move to freeing prices somewhat. There will be no explosive effect if this money is "drawn off." Prices will be released quietly. I believe that major corrections are needed to the prices for diesel fuel, oil, gas, and electricity. Wholesale prices must be brought closer to world levels. It is unimaginable to live in conditions when a tonne of crude oil costs $30. This is downright waste. You will not live to see any resource saving, any technological progress. And another point: Prices can be "released" only in conditions of demonopolization. Or under conditions of rigid regulation of profitability levels. For example, machine building output is altogether uncompetitive. All its high profitability is based on its monopoly position in the domestic market. This is an illusory prosperity. Turning back to the problem of organizing the market, let me add that we need a reform of the trade system. This is being mentioned somehow in passing, it is hinted at, but we are perfectly well aware that all attempts to combat abuses in the trade system are fruitless. Unless we reform the trade system, we will fail in the entire perestroyka of the economy. The present trade system took shape in the thirties, when distribution was based on rationing. We lived with this rationing system for decades. Stock allocations are a kind of macrorationing. Moscow was allocated a certain quantity of meat stocks, Tambov was allocated a different quantity... In reality, these stock allocations became the property of the trade system's wholesale link. It was like czar and God in one. I'll do as I like. This is already the beginning of mafia-like structures. These "tax farmers" must be squeezed out. Retail trade, the store, the firm must be the basic link in the trade system. Operating on the principle of direct ties with suppliers or commission-based trade with enterprises. Trading organizations should be licensed by the state. A retail firm or a store must be the basic link, and the wholesale link ought to be its backup, offering its services on a competitive basis. And the stock allocation mechanism should be abolished. Otherwise, no purchases of Western goods will help us out. They all will get bogged down in the trading morass. Efforts to improve output quality will not produce any results, either. This is my profoundly held belief.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] What is the Gosplan's role in the impendent market economy?

[Petrakov] The adoption of the "package" of radical measures to launch market relations will not repeal the state's regulating role. Alas, our central planning organs have always done what was not needed. They "shepherded" enterprises around the clock. What should be produced, how it should be produced, who should supply raw materials, where should output be delivered.... Everything according to schedule. The state must give all this up. Bogged down in this routine, the Gosplan failed to perform the functions which are within the power of only a centralized authority, namely: major scientific and technical programs, infrastructure, communications, ecology, finances. These questions cannot be resolved at the level of a single republic, region, oblast, or rayon, as it is attempted to do now. There must be a single financial system. A common market for the whole country. And, of course, unionwide social guarantees for those on low incomes and the elderly.

There is another aspect associated with the state's new role: It must stand up and defend the consumer and honest competition. Ministries and departments are more accustomed to a producer's diktat. The ministry is a state organ. But does it defend the consumers' interests? Take the Gosplan as example. Just compare the number of people dealing with questions of planning, production, and distribution and of those studying the demand and needs of the population and of producers. The result will probably be something like 50 to one, if not 100 to one.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] Can you cast some light on the way the ideas of the reform's radicalization, which

were recently discussed at the Presidential Council, matured and were worked out?

[Petrakov] The Western press produced some lively comment on the economic section of M.S. Gorbachev's first speech at the Presidential Council. Demonopolization, creation of a securities market, joint stock corporations, reform of the credit system and the price formation mechanism—these are the components of the radical turnabout in the market's direction. Whatever I have said so far represents my personal beliefs, but I cannot accurately predict the outcome of debates in the supreme organs of power. The only thing of which I am convinced is that the line of creating a civilized, full-blooded, modern market has now been adopted with absolute firmness. My position is that we need our own option, but not the Mazowiecki option. There are economists whose opinions differ. There are yet others who call not for a market, but for the direct opposite. One more retreat toward edict management of the economy would be simply unbearable. The maneuver of transition to the market must be effected swiftly, carefully, and energetically.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] Is the Ministry of Finance correct in its policy of "spreading" the state budget deficit among territories?

[Petrakov] In my view, this financial manipulation—dividing the exchequer's deficit among republics and regions—is incorrect by definition. The deficit stems from excessive financing of state programs, from the imbalance between these programs and existing resources. The source of the exchequer's ruin is the inefficiency of the implementation of nationwide programs. This is the level at which the deficit should be tackled, by cutting our coat according to our cloth. As for sending down quotas for the "absorption" of expenditure at local level—this is a wrong move. This is at odds with the recently adopted Law on Local Self-Management. Local budgets can be in deficit only when local authorities fail to properly organize their activity. If they have embarked on some investment project and their revenue fails to cover their expenditure.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] Nikolay Yakovlevich, what is your opinion on the existence of regional economic accountability?

[Petrakov] An altogether unfortunate term. The public is confused and cannot comprehend why one progressive economist sharply rejects regional economic accountability while another one fervently supports it. The point is that economic accountability in general is a purely "production" term. Maximum results at minimum costs—this is its simple essence. Those who reject regional economic accountability emphasize the point that this is not at all a territorial "matter." The territory should be responsible for people, and the enterprise for production. This should be the social division of management activity.

This principle was violated in our country. Local soviets were appendages of enterprises, especially in places where a major enterprise is a city's master. Enterprises use their own funds to build housing, roads, young pioneer palaces, and polyclinics. I believe that this is a somewhat distorted form of working people's social security. It creates social tension. For example, a worker employed by the plant enjoys priority in the allocation of apartments, while the teacher who teaches his child or the physician who treats the worker himself at the rayon polyclinic may not live long enough to acquire an apartment. Exactly the same happens with the distribution of goods and foodstuffs. The stores may be empty, but if you work at the aviation plant you get your foodstuffs through bulk ordering. If this happens at a ministry it is called a privilege, but at plants it is known as social protection. Where is the logic, where did such craftiness come from?

This is why, if anything were to be radically changed, I would identify it as regional economic sovereignty. Why not territorial economic accountability? The taxes received by regional organs of power from enterprises should not be invested in new production facilities, profit should not be sought, and funds should be invested in social, cultural, and consumer service facilities. An economically accountable structure would always proceed from the premise that revenue should exceed expenditure. But if a region were to take this path, it would "slam the door" on all social construction. It would collect taxes from enterprises under ministries' jurisdiction and would use these taxes to build its own enterprises which would yield the maximum possible profit. This is altogether pointless. Therefore, in my view, the idea of regional sovereignty would be preferable.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] There is also the following aspect of the problem: Could the poor and depopulated oblasts of the Non-Chernozem Zone not stake a claim on part of the funds accruing from the profits of enterprises in gold-extracting Kolyma or oil-extracting Tyumen?

[Petrakov] In actual fact, the regions which yield all our foreign currency are among the most depopulated. Such taxation is totally useless. Another point is that we should not create something akin to the Arab emirates in Tyumen. Nobody needs that, either. The entire country invested capital in oil extraction. But the prevailing situation, whereby the foreign currency producing shop is like a bootmaker who goes around barefoot, is also absurd. Therefore, we need a sensible taxation policy. Hitherto it has been slanted entirely in favor of the exchequer. While pumping out dollars, we do not give back even rubles.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] The so-called "anticommodity lobby" is quite active and vociferous nowadays. At the same time, we can often hear complaints that they are not given a platform and the advocates of the market have "monopolized" economic science and current affairs writing....

[Petrakov] As regards Sergeyev's group, whose members are supposedly not allowed to open their mouths, this is, to put it mildly, untrue. I do not always have the time to read the press in detail, but I have personally read two or three interviews with Sergeyev himself. On one occasion I happened to watch a major television dispute between Sergeyev and Popov. I cannot understand how it can be claimed that the "anticommodity lobby" is being held back. Everybody knows their point of view. Even foreign diplomats know it. This is first. Second: I cannot see how a press organ can be "obliged" to publish an article fervently preaching dogmatic views which have been refuted by life itself.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] One gets the impression that the "anticommodity lobby" upholds not the truth but the corporate interests of the old political economy of socialism, which has been devalued but to which they have made their own "contribution." At the same time, many of our readers express the opinion that perestroyka is developing along empirical lines. Do we have a theory about the transitional period, a theory which we could safely trust?

[Petrakov] You are both right and wrong. Generally speaking, every society develops along empirical lines. Over the last 12-18 months I have studied very intensively the way other countries have extricated themselves from economic crisis situations. The point is that you are wrong in assuming that we are the only ones in trouble. Our troubles boil down to the fact that we managed to end up in a typical economic crisis situation in peacetime. Following World War I, and especially following World War II, virtually all the leading powers in the world—even the United States—found themselves in a deep economic morass. Japan and the FRG were in the worst position. Economic reforms were implemented there, a course of market orientation was adopted. And they "got on in the world." But they developed and groped for the way out also along empirical lines. I do not know of a single country which extricated itself from a crisis by implementing some strictly scientific theory. Initially they built on paper and then in real life. Another point—the reformers' economic views underwent transformations. How did Keynes' theory emerge? In essence, it emerged when the great depression set in, as a theory about ways out of the crisis. To a certain extent, it was applied by Roosevelt who adopted several Keynesian thesis. Basically, however, the Roosevelt administration also groped to find its way step by step. Exactly the same way was taken by outstanding personalities like Ludwig Erhard, who implemented the famous West German mark reform, and Guido Carli in Italy, who managed to implement a whole series of totally pragmatic steps to strengthen the lire. There was a very interesting reform of the yen in 1948. In this context, I perceive no great danger in the fact that we lack a sophisticated theory of our economy's perestroyka, a plan of measures, as it might be said in the old parlance. But we do have definite, perfectly precise, and worked out principles and ideas.

Now we are witnessing a pilgrimage of Western economists to the Soviet Union. Their suggestions and advice virtually coincide with what we intend to do. Thus, there is no shortage of knowledgeable people as regards theory. The practical side is much more acute: Where will the path we are taking lead us? You can see that everything has to be very thoroughly weighed here. For example, what will the Mazowiecki option produce in our country? What will the option of closing down ministries and switching to joint stock corporations produce? You can sit and calculate for as long as you like, but you will be unable to work everything out. Something else should happen here: You take some decisive step and then very vigilantly monitor the situation—public opinion, economic parameters, and the entire mass of foreign economic factors. All this must be monitored in order to avoid making irreparable mistakes.

There is no easy way to economic recovery. We must make up our minds!

Agricultural

Agricultural Developments for 19-24 Apr

LD2504034890

[Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 19-24 April. Times of broadcast, given in GMT, are in parentheses at the end of each item.

19-20 April
No significant developments reported

21 April
In Chimkent and Dzhambul Oblasts in southern Kazakhstan, the sowing of corn grain and silage started today. This spring more than 2.5 million hectares will be sown with corn in Kazakhstan. The work is being done mainly by specialized teams, many of which have become leaseholders. Likewise, the sowing of barley, potatoes, vegetables, and sugarbeet is under way in southern Kazakhstan. In all, the spring sowing area of the republic will be over 28 million hectares. (1100)

22 April
No significant developments reported.

23 April
Planting of early potato varieties has begun in southern parts of the Non-Chernozem Zone of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. Planting of potatoes has also begun earlier than usual in the central and northern areas of that zone. V.M. Lubintsov, head of the laboratory at the Potato Research Institute, says the field work and planting of potatoes is roughly two weeks ahead of schedule this year. He advises farmers to get their seed and equipment ready. (1100)

24 April
No significant developments reported.

Scientific

Space Cooperation Pact Signed With W. Europe

LD2504203590 Moscow TASS in English 1849 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] Paris April 25 TASS—The USSR Government and the European Space Agency (ESA) today signed an agreement on cooperation in the exploration and use of space for peaceful purposes.

The agreement was signed at the ESA Paris headquarters by Soviet Ambassador to France Yakov Ryabov and the agency's Director General Reimar Lust.

Speakers at the signatory ceremony unanimously noted that the document was of an exceptional nature. It is the first time that the Soviet Union and West European countries, represented in the ESA, has concluded such a broad treaty, which provides for a vast spectrum of joint scientific-technical research.

The research efforts include work to explore the solar-terrestrial interaction, the joint study of the surface and the atmosphere of the earth using satellite systems, a programme to peer into microgravitation, and astrophysical research.

Experts beleive that the agreement will enable Soviet and West European space researchers to pool their efforts, giving a fresh boost to the development of space science.

Addressing those present at the ESA headquarters, Lust stressed that the European Space Agency wants to expand Soviet-West European ties for the peaceful use of space. "We are interested in this, because the USSR is the sole country in the world that has a permanent orbiting station in space," Lust said.

"The programme to study microgravitation, an all-important one in preparing future space flights, is feasible exactly at this station. I can already picture an astronaut, representing the ESA, working with colleagues from the USSR at the Soviet station.

"We have already witnessed cooperation between the USSR and a separate West European country, France, in part. The new Soviet-West European agreement signals a big step forward in scientific-technical, practical and political terms," Lust said.

Other speakers pointed out that the document signed would promote European cooperation in peaceful space exploration, which fits well into the process of detente on the continent and contributes to building a common European home and a confederation of European nations.

Both the Soviet Union and Western Europe, they said, have already amassed vast experience in space exploration and have ambitious plans, in which there is much in common. For instance, both sides are engaged in the development of space shuttles (the Soviet shuttle Buran has already made its first test flight). West Europeans are also developing their space station "Columbus" and the powerful booster rocket "Ariane-5".

All this, in the opinion of both sides, opens good prospects for increasing European cooperation in the interests of all peoples living on this continent and promotes peace, stability and mutual understanding in Europe.

Correction to Interview on Space Initiatives

WA2504181590

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "Minister Interviewed on Future Space Initiatives," published on pages 67-71 on the 24 April Soviet Union DAILY REPORT:

Page 69, column two, last paragraph, make read: ...stations have to service satellites, including military... (changing "be serviced by" to "service")

Page 70, column one, second complete paragraph, third sentence, make read: ...weather, ecological, and observation satellites could be delivered here for repair (which is much... (rephrasing)

Page 71, column one, second paragraph, second sentence, make read: ...your branch are great. For example, all... (deleting "not")

Military

Northern Fleet's Bases Checked for Radioactivity

LD2504150590 Moscow TASS in English 1404 GMT 25 Apr 90

[By TASS correspondent Vasiliy Belousov]

[Text] Murmansk, Northern Russia, April 25 TASS—Facilities of the Soviet northern fleet, previously top secret, have been opened to experts from an interdepartmental commission, set up at the request of parliamentary deputy Andrey Zolotkov to check the level of radiation there. The commission worked for several days at the fleet's bases and coastal shipbuilding facilities.

Commission member Yuriy Sivintsev, professor of the Academy of Sciences' Institute of Atomic Energy, told reporters here that, according to the commission's findings, the radiation level "does not exceed the natural background even on board nuclear submarines."

The commission, which included representatives of the military and civilian nature-conservation agencies, also checked the base for nuclear-powered ice-breakers of the Murmansk Shipping Company and special facilities for burying radioactive waste.

Zolotkov said "No deviations from the norm were revealed there. The checks covered all sites that were deemed most vulnerable to radiation danger." He said such checks of nuclear fleet bases will be regular in the

future and that the findings of the checks will be reported to the population through the mass media.

Akhromeyev Answers Soldiers' Phone Questions

PM2504103390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Apr 90 First Edition pp 1,2

[Account of 14 April readers' phone-in with Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, "USSR presidential adviser" and member of the Supreme Soviet, prepared by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Lieutenant Colonel V. Kosarev: "Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev: We Must Fight for the Truth"]

[Text] **The number 941-24-40 is a well-known phone-in number for KRASNAYA ZVEZDA readers. Every day from 1000 through 1200 hours Moscow time it is the "busiest" in the editorial office. Nonetheless it could not take the pressure on Saturday 14 April when, as announced, Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, USSR presidential adviser and member of the country's Supreme Soviet, answered readers' questions. There was not even a second's pause between telephone calls.**

Even then, the day before the telephone was literally jammed by requests for us to write down questions for Sergey Fedorovich. Although we began our dialogue ahead of time and ended it later than scheduled, we editorial office staff had to suffer a considerable number of recriminations from people who were simply unable to get through.

But the most persistent or the luckiest did get through—41 of them. That day invisible threads stretched out to our telephone from 25 of the country's cities and eight of the union republics. But read for yourselves—here you have the stenographic record of the dialogue—abridged, of course, owing to the limited space in the newspaper.

Such Varied Questions

[Tatarinov] This is Viktor Alekseyevich Tatarinov, an engineer, calling from Vilnius. My son is to serve in the Army. But what is to be done—the commissariats have been paralyzed in our country. I do not want the kid to be a deserter. Let every man serve his time in the Army as prescribed by the Constitution. I myself served, and he knows that this is necessary.

[Akhromeyev] I am grateful to you for this telephone call both as a citizen and as a military man. I am grateful to you for your patriotism and love of your homeland, and I am sure that this is manifest in your action. But to be specific, I advise you to address yourself to the Baltic Military District headquarters, which will ensure that your son is conscripted into the Armed Forces ranks.

[Pozhelayev] I wish you good health, Comrade Marshal of the Soviet Union; this is Major Pozhelayev calling from the Armored Troops Academy. What are my first names? Just write the initials A.I. My question is this. As you are now one of the USSR president's advisers, do you turn to anyone for advice or do you prepare materials on the basis of your personal opinion, knowledge, and experience alone?

[Akhromeyev] I turn to very many organizations for advice. Primarily to the Defense Ministry and, particularly, to the USSR Armed Forces General Staff when materials are being prepared on military questions. I also consult the Foreign Ministry when military-political questions crop up. I am trying to pay more frequent visits to troops, military schools, and academies. I have addressed many academies in Moscow. I have been invited as a people's deputy. Admittedly, the Armored Troops Academy, from which I graduated in 1952, has not as yet issued me with an invitation. I am in constant contact with officers and generals. That is how I elaborate materials.

[Pozhelayev] How often is your advice required?

[Akhromeyev] The president himself gives me instructions, perhaps, once or twice a month. But I am aware of the most pressing military-political problems and I find the opportunity, when necessary, to express my opinion.

[Zazhivnov] Is that Comrade Akhromeyev? My name is Aleksey Vasilyevich Zazhivnov, a war and labor veteran from Tolyatti. I am concerned about where our leadership is taking the country. What are they doing with us and for us?

[Akhromeyev] I understand your concern. Very many problems have accumulated. Many of them left over from the past, while a considerable number have been generated by our mistakes. But the state leadership and the CPSU are doing a great deal to solve them—you can probably all see that. I am sure that we will make a breakthrough, both in the economy and in the resolution of ethnic problems.

[Sarvatov and Aslanov] These are representatives of the Meskhetian Turks on the line—the provisional organizational committee in Moscow. There are two of us—Tashtan Sarvatov and Yusuf Aslanov. You are aware that our guys serve conscientiously in the ranks of the Soviet Army. As a participant in the war you also know that more than 26,000 of the 40,000 Meskhetian Turks who fought for our common homeland gave their lives. Today our people—both the frontline soldiers and their children and grandchildren—have found themselves in the position of refugees in our great country. What ways do you see of resolving our problems? Will we be able to return to our historical homeland?

[Akhromeyev] Yes, interethnic relations are a source of common pain for us. As for my personal opinion, I believe that all Meskhetian Turks have the right to live in their homeland. But it will obviously not be possible to solve this problem within a short timeframe. The union government is currently working with the Georgian Government on the gradual return of your people to their native areas. If you think that I can help you in any way, please write me a letter.

[Pakhomov] This is Viktor Nikolayevich Pakhomov. I am an engineer and live in Bryansk. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA recently printed a commentary on the taking of military hostages in the Transcaucasus. Servicemen are currently being discharged and we parents are concerned as to how the safety of the servicemen discharged from this region will be ensured.

[Akhromeyev] Everything will be properly organized. The men being discharged will be sent home in groups. Unit and district staff commanders will be responsible for their safety. I think that everything will be in order.

[Pakhomov] Won't there be delays with the discharge?

[Akhromeyev] No, no delays are envisaged.

[Pakhomov] I have another question, concerning the storage and safekeeping of weapons. During conversations at the plant we and the workers often say that it would be probably be right for the law to make provision for fixed penalties—including the supreme penalty—for the irresponsible storage, theft, or sale of weapons.

[Akhromeyev] I cannot say now whether the law will be toughened up. But I personally agree with your opinion. People must be made strictly accountable for omissions in weapons storage. As a USSR people's deputy I will report your opinion to the USSR Supreme Soviet without fail.

[Svitech] Hello, I'm Viktor Tikhonovich Svitech, a retired officer, born in 1923, from Dzhambul. I'm concerned about what is to happen with Russia. Germany is uniting and there are enough revanchists there. Will Germany suddenly attack Russia again?

[Akhromeyev] We will try to ensure that this does not happen. It is not 1941 now. And Europe is certainly not the same. The USSR will strive to create a system of collective security in Europe. We will maintain the country's defense capability at the requisite level.

[Svitech] I have a second question. The Army is being cut back. What is to happen to the hundreds of thousands of officers who are being discharged into the reserve? Where will those people who served abroad live?

[Akhromeyev] Approximately 70,000 of the 100,000 that are being discharged have apartments, while 30,000 who served in remote areas and abroad will obtain housing in their chosen place of residence. This problem is under the control of the government and the Defense Ministry. Admittedly, officers discharged into the reserve will obviously not obtain their housing that soon. The law on this question is being broken in a number of areas.

[Svitech] I have another question. During the Great Patriotic War I was recommended for the Polish Cross, but I have hitherto been unable to obtain my medal.

[Akhromeyev] Write me a letter, set out everything in detail. I will try to help. My address is USSR Supreme Soviet, Moscow....

[Kazennov] This is Candidate of Economic Sciences Sergey Yuryevich Kazennov speaking. In view of the radical changes in the world, how do you see the need to substantially review the USSR's military activity (military doctrine), its geographical framework, the structure of the Armed Forces, the military basing system, and military aid to foreign states? I'm sorry for asking such a long question.

[Akhromeyev] No, it is a good question, although I cannot give it a short answer. Of course, with the lessening of military tension in the world and the threat of war our views of the problems of defense sufficiency are changing, as is the structure of the Armed Forces. That is, we are providing an adequate response to changes in the situation. But both positive changes and those that complicate our military-political position are occurring. Both need to be taken into account. We must make a sober assessment of the situation. The military danger to the Soviet Union has not disappeared. We must maintain Army and Navy combat readiness at the requisite level in line with the extent of that danger. We must also take into account our troops' return home from Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

[Kazennov] But why do we always expect reciprocal steps from the United States when we are cutting back our military forces, at a time when we each have different potentials and tasks? After all, we now hold parity in terms of nuclear missile weapons. But not in terms of others....

[Akhromeyev] You are right, we must constantly maintain approximate military equilibrium in the sphere of strategic nuclear arms. Anyone who considers this mistaken is himself utterly mistaken or is trying to disorient us. The other armed forces must be adequate to reliably ensure the country's defense. It is these principles that are the foundation for maintaining the country's defense capability at the minimum required level. But there must of course be corresponding steps from the United States and other Western countries. We are now cutting back our armed forces in Europe—in large numbers, moreover. Yet the United States is refusing even to hold talks with us on reducing naval forces, where they have the edge. Hence the following question arises: How can we trust this policy? I agree with you that there is no direct symmetry in our countries' military structure. But there is military-political dependence, and every country must take this into consideration.

[Khudoley] This is pensioner Yakov Afanasyevich Khudoley calling; I live in Moscow. This is my question. In the past the United States adopted the naval strategy of forward lines. Provision was made for building 600 ships. Is this strategy being put into effect?

[Akhromeyev] Since the international situation is improving the United States has abandoned the construction of the 600 ships. But this is not changing a great deal as yet. We know that their navy is very powerful, and the Soviet Union is still surrounded by U.S. military and naval bases at which roughly 500,000 U.S. servicemen are deployed. The United States maintains a vast armada of attack-carrier formations. That is why we are endeavoring to begin talks with the United States on reductions in naval forces.

History Leaves No Scope for Vanity

[Bulychev] This is Lieutenant Colonel (Retired) Aleksey Timofeyevich Bulychev, a participant in the war. I had difficulty getting through to you although I live in Moscow. Tell me why several thousand Polish officers were shot at Katyn. After all, they could not have been shot without a reason, even a fabricated reason.

[Akhromeyev] Aleksey Timofeyevich, can I answer why they were annihilated? The documents say one thing—they were shot. We know how Beria and his minions acted in such cases. But we do not have any details as yet, although the archives have been studied for more than a decade. The culprits tried not to leave any trace of their crimes.

[Bulychev] Perhaps the Germans planted these documents—after all, they did occupy the territory.

[Akhromeyev] No, the documents were stored in Moscow, and they are genuine. Some bear the signature of the deputy people's commissar for internal affairs. So the story of provocation no longer arises. But it is incomprehensible why this fanatical decision was taken.

[Bulychev] So the reasons are nonetheless unclear. Why then present this as a sensation?

[Akhromeyev] It is not a sensation. The Polish public have been demanding that the truth be cleared up for many years.

[Bulychev] They have... But 660,000 of our soldiers who liberated Poland from the German occupiers are buried there and today the memorials in their honor, the fraternal tombs are being destroyed. Why are we shutting our eyes to this?

[Akhromeyev] That is another question. I agree that it must also be taken into account. I do not think that such actions are committed by the Polish people. But facts are facts after all: 15,000 Polish servicemen perished on our territory. We must investigate this.

[Bulychev] Why was it necessary to blacken our country and our history without finding out the truth?

[Akhromeyev] You are talking to me as if I was involved in this. At that time (in 1940) I had only just put on military uniform and I fought against the fascists from 1941 onward. I had no idea about Katyn. There are, unfortunately, many questions in our history which we cannot answer. But they will have to be answered sooner or later. That is our responsibility to the people.

[Kuznetsov] Hello, this is Major General of Aviation Nikolay Stepanovich Kuznetsov. I am serving in Moscow. Comrade Marshal of the Soviet Union, when will the denigration of our country and everything that we hold sacred end? This process is, after all, being organized and conducted in a deliberate manner. It is understandable when OGONEK does this. But Colonel General Volkogonov has written a book about Stalin. I am simply indignant that our country's entire history is being wiped out in a catalogue of Stalin's crimes....

[Akhromeyev] I agree with you that we need to assess the past in an objective manner. It is inadmissible to criticize our entire past. But a political struggle is under way, a real conflict between philosophies. We must fight for the truth, for humane, democratic socialism—there is simply no other way. I am convinced that this struggle will be a long one, but it is important not to split but unite our society during this struggle. As for Stalin, that is a special question which cannot be given a short answer. But I believe that M.S. Gorbachev in his report of 2 November 1987 to mark the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution produced the most truthful assessment of his activity.

[Shekt] I am Major (Retired) Emmanuil Yakovlevich Shekt. I now live in Leningrad. Our common holiday—the 45th anniversary of the Great Victory—is soon. This is what I want to say. We must be more resolute in countering those people endeavoring to belittle the significance of our victory. Some people have even dubbed it a "Pyrrhic" victory. That is vile.

[Akhromeyev] Thank you for upholding these positions. I fully share them. Our losses were vast but they ensured the freedom and life of the generations which make up our people today. And, incidentally, the life and freedom of those people who are defaming the victory.

[Kuksevich] Reserve Colonel Feliks Sergeyevich Kuksevich on the line from Sverdlovsk. I read your rebuke to OGONEK's editor in chief with great interest and share its views completely, like many of my comrades. You gave that reproof with great sincerity, like a real crusader and communist. We lack true crusaders today. They make themselves scarce when we need to hold a united stance.

[Akhromeyev] Thank you. Then we must fight together.

[Kuksevich] Quite right. OGONEK's narrow-minded tendencies are speculative and will not win people's understanding or support. You have set about defending society's ideological, ethical, and moral values. Thank you for that. I want to wish you success on the eve of the 45th anniversary of the victory as a war veteran.

[Akhromeyev] Thank you for your congratulations. I wholeheartedly congratulate you and your veteran friends.

Military Affairs

[Grib] This is Lieutenant Colonel Vladimir Trofimovich Grib on the line from Krasnodar. Comrade Marshal of the Soviet Union, this is the problem: Our subunits' organizational staff structure does not conform to the scale of the tasks which they have to resolve. The units in our district are mainly those with a reduced number of personnel. Men are on fatigues the entire time. It is hard to conduct combat training. Something must be done to ensure that personnel do not merely serve their time in the army but really get down to combat training and to ensure that people can serve the motherland.

[Akhromeyev] Vladimir Trofimovich, mobilization readiness must not be forgotten. Reduced units are necessary. Nonetheless I ask you to write to me with your suggestions in more detail.

[Grib] Ok, Sergey Fedorovich. I will write without fail. My second question is addressed to you as a USSR people's deputy. It is to be more precise a proposal. Those people who attack the Army should be rebuffed at the Supreme Soviet. It is painful to hear certain speeches.

[Akhromeyev] We cannot forbid deputies to speak. But I personally, along with other deputies, am trying to rebuff unwarranted accusations. Although this is not, of course, always what happens. Everyone acts according to his convictions. After all, you know that military deputies include people of varying views.

[Grib] Yes, we know that and are ashamed of some of them. We still hope that there will be healthy forces within our parliament who will uphold our Army's honor.

[Akhromeyev] Let's do this together.

[Prokhalev] Is that Moscow? Good morning. Lvov on the line. This is Lieutenant Colonel Semen Ilich Prokhalev from the Carpathian Military District. IZVESTIYA printed a conversation 11 April with USSR People's Deputy Major Lopatin about the draft military reform. And a draft USSR Defense Law was discussed 10 April at a sitting of the USSR Defense Ministry Collegium. I ask you, Comrade Marshal of the Soviet Union, to comment on these two drafts. Are they independent documents, or does one stem from the other?

[Akhromeyev] They are quite different, independent documents. The defense law was elaborated by the Defense Ministry and General Staff leadership and was submitted for discussion to the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and State Security Questions. After this we will examine it in the second half of the year and adopt it at the USSR Supreme Soviet. But Comrade Lopatin's draft was prepared by a group of officer deputies. It had not been coordinated with the Defense Ministry. I do not know about the future procedure for working on this document.

[Prokhalev] Comrade Marshal of the Soviet Union, I believe that Lopatin only thinks in tactical terms. Prominent military leaders and scientists must be enlisted to elaborate the concept for military reform.

[Akhromeyev] To this I can say that the Defense Ministry has instructions from the USSR president to prepare a draft law on military reform. Comrade Lopatin produced the draft on his own initiative. I disagree with the draft in many respects.

[Prokhalev] In that draft I read about territorial-national troop formations. Its authors advocate—as I understood it—these bodies' being under the jurisdiction of local organs of power.

[Akhromeyev] We have statewide Armed Forces.

[Yezhelin] Rostov-na-Donu calling.

[Akhromeyev] I took part in that city's liberation during the Great Patriotic War.

[Yezhelin] This is Reserve Sergeant Valeriy Vasilyevich Yezhelin speaking. The Armed Forces are currently being cut back. It would be a good thing to disband the military construction units which are not affiliated to the Defense Ministry.

[Akhromeyev] Those units which work for civilian departments number roughly 300,000 men. They have indeed no connection with the Defense Ministry from the viewpoint of the tasks they resolve. But the problem is that there is virtually no work force in some areas where they are deployed. And the construction sites are very important. Nonetheless we are now putting this question before the government. Over the next two years their numbers will be significantly reduced and by 1995 they will possibly be disbanded altogether.

[Yezhelin] I have another question. Why has the military profession ceased to be prestigious so that, if anyone has the slightest chance of not serving in the Army, he takes advantage of it without fail?

[Akhromeyev] To be brief, I would say the following. A political struggle is under way in the country between those people who favor and those who oppose socialism. The opponents of socialism know that the main forces in their way are the Communist Party and the Armed Forces. That is why they are attacking them so virulently today. Demonstrators' chants and slogans proclaiming "Down with the CPSU" and "Army of occupation, go home!" are put forward together.

There is an oath in the Armed Forces whereby every serviceman swears to defend the Soviet socialist motherland and the Constitution. The socialist system will be preserved as long as the Army and Navy are monolithic, trained, and instructed. That is why these antisocialist forces and the mass media that speak for them—their troubadours—attack and slander the Army. If you favor humane, democratic socialism you must fight and expose these slanderers; we have no other option.

[Chernov] I am a retired officer, my name is Yuriy Arkadyevich Chernov, and I am from Minsk. As the grandfather of three young men I am very concerned by "hazing" in the Soviet Union. Will it be stopped?

[Akhromeyev] I am ashamed to face you. The Army must eradicate "hazing." Tremendous steps—both educative and legal steps—are being taken to do this.

[Chernov] I encountered "hazing" in 1965. And it is still flourishing now.

[Akhromeyev] You realize that this is not only an Army problem. We in the Army receive people whose morals have already been shaped. That is why things are going slowly. Nonetheless I believe that we will be successful.

The Human Factor

[Chernyy] Hello, hello again. This is Private Chernyy from Leningrad. I telephoned but I was cut off. Sergey Fedorovich, this is the point. I have been doing extended military service since 1986. I received a large dose of radiation and am now ill. After my treatment I will be disabled, so I am being discharged from the Army. I do not want to be an invalid at 28 years of age, I want to serve.

[Akhromeyev] Everything depends on your state of health. The main thing is for you to get well. This is what we'll do: Undergo the treatment now and then, if necessary, write to me. I will try to help you.

[Perfun] Is that 941-24-40? Is Akhromeyev there? I am calling from Krasnodar. I am Major (Retired) Vasiliy Grigoryevich Perfun, a Category II invalid. Comrade Marshal of the Soviet Union, we are a group of invalids and war veterans, seven people—we have been asking the local authorities for five years now to install telephones for us. But, to our great regret and shame, all our efforts have failed to bear fruit. The 45th anniversary of the Great Victory is drawing near and we do not feel like victors but like the vanquished. The local authorities are defeating us. The whole question now rests on a cable. We have already appealed on 148 occasions (we have kept a record of our efforts) to local leaders of all offices and ranks. But to no avail. Can you possibly help us? We cannot rely on anyone any more.

[Akhromeyev] I will try to help, Vasiliy Grigoryevich. Write me a letter. Then I will be able to address the Krasnodar Krayispolkom [kray soviet executive committee] officially on this question.

[Ivanov] Is that the phone-in number? This is Lieutenant Colonel Vladimir Ivanovich Ivanov, Moscow Military District, Kalinin. Sergey Fedorovich, what can you do to change the attitude to officers who are conscripted from nonmilitary VUZ's [higher educational institutions]? They feel like second-class citizens.

[Akhromeyev] Let us be specific. I am not someone who considers such officers second-class citizens. There are none in the Army. What is the matter specifically?

[Ivanov] The problem is that by the age of 45 an officer has usually completed 25 years' service and correspondingly receives a full pension. But an officer who is conscripted after attending a nonmilitary VUZ and who is discharged at the same age has not completed the extra two or three years' service entitling him to a full pension and is not entitled to avail himself of a hospital or sanatorium. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA has written about this on several occasions. The defense minister has issued no decree and there are no directives on this subject. Everything depends on the goodwill of his chief as to whether he will or will not be allowed to complete his period of service. Is that really fair?

[Akhromeyev] I agree, it is unfair. It is an important question and must be settled. Write to me, set out your ideas so that I can put an official petition to the minister.

[Shakirova] Hello, this is Moldavia calling. I am Asiya Akhnabovna Shakirova from Beltsy, a serviceman's wife.

[Akhromeyev] You could have written to me as my voter.

[Shakirova] My husband has served in the Army for 20 years. His unit is now being cut back. We will be left without housing and without a future at all. We have been here since 1986. He could have been discharged following the cuts but we have no housing.

[Akhromeyev] But they do not have the right to discharge your husband until he has been given an apartment.

[Shakirova] That's right, but he has not been given one. We do not know what is to become of us. We have a small child and I do not work.

[Akhromeyev] He will be given an apartment. Write to me at the Supreme Soviet. The law is the law. I will help you.

[Lebedev] I am a Muscovite—Captain Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Lebedev. We are all saying that perestroyka is proceeding throughout our country but we, the lowest officer echelon, are not conscious of this perestroyka within the Army. Here is an example. The housing situation is very tight in our country. But there are officers who have obtained apartments without waiting in line. One of them has a father who is a commander. This officer divorced his wife and was immediately given an apartment without standing in

line. There's more. General Borovko came along last year. Whereupon he obtained an apartment, bypassing the line. So there is no social justice.

[Akhromeyev] Your facts must be checked out and carefully investigated. I ask you to write me a detailed letter about everything. What is your troop unit? I will check everything out and will write to my comrade, Army General Tretyak, about this.

[Lebedev] But it was the chiefs from the Air Defense Main Staff Command who decided to give him the apartment and jump the line. The housing commission solves nothing in our country. All the officers are indignant about this.

[Akhromeyev] We are agreed, and we will check out everything. If necessary, the Party Control Committee will tackle this.

Editorial Conclusion We were forced to call a halt here, although of course it was by no means possible to talk about all the problems or all the questions raised by our readers during the dialogue. But it is important that people talked about the most important thing, the most painful issue for them personally. This convinces us that direct dialogue is necessary and that the "reader-newspaper" hot line must exist.

Baltic Republics

Vilnius Radio Carries 25 Apr Council Session

Agenda Presented

LD2504114290

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0900 GMT on 25 April begins carrying a live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council proceedings at the Supreme Council Palace in Vilnius.

The session opens with the deputy in the chair reading the day's agenda:

"1. The law of the republic of Lithuania concerning provisional measures under the circumstances of the economic blockade imposed by the USSR; 2. questions to the government; 3. debates on the law on enterprises of the republic of Lithuania." He notes that the third point on the agenda will be allowed only if time permits.

At 0901 GMT Landsbergis makes a statement on the political situation.

At 0910 GMT Prime Minister Prunskiene delivers her report. This is followed by questions put to Prunskiene.

At 0935 GMT the deputy in the chair reads the following, in Russian: "The council of the directors of industrial enterprises in the town of Kovrov, Vladimir Oblast, has adopted a decision to continue strictly to observe obligations in agreements for the delivery of tractors and their spares. We would be grateful for the traditional fulfillment by Lithuanian enterprises of their obligations for the delivery to the Kovrov clothing mill of the 'Drobe' products."

At 0940 GMT Deputy Prime Minister Algirdas Brazauskas presents his report on the economic situation. At 1000 GMT questions are put to Brazauskas.

At 1019 GMT Foreign Minister Algirdas Saudargas reads a statement, in Russian, on foreign oil supplies.

At 1022 GMT further questions are put to Prunskiene and Brazauskas. Local technical problems prevent any processing of material carried in the live relay between 1022-1043 GMT.

At 1043 GMT an unidentified speaker states that the republic needs 1.7 billion tonnes of oil a year. Touching on problems in refining oil, he points out that the Mazeikiai oil refinery needs 15,000 tonnes of oil per day. Brazauskas says that the republic would pay $892 million a year for imported oil, $184 million a year for imported coal, and $681 million a year for imported gas.

At 1049 GMT Deputy Stasys Malkevicius denies ever demanding that Landsbergis and Prunskiene should resign.

At 1053 GMT the session adjourns until 1230 GMT.

Antiblockade Law Debated

LD2504141590

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1230 GMT on 25 April resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius. The deputy in the chair explains the necessity of introducing a law on antiblockade measures in the republic. Copies of the draft law are distributed to the deputies.

At 1236 GMT debates start on individual articles in the draft law, with almost all speakers supporting the introduction of the law, and proposing amendments to individual articles. An unidentified deputy states that he is convinced that people of Lithuania are determined to survive the blockade. He urges all deputies to spend more time in their constituencies.

At 1254 GMT Deputy Malkevicius says that more powers should be granted to the government, and suggests that deputies travel to various parts of the Soviet Union and even abroad to explain Lithuania's plight.

At 1257 GMT Deputy Rudys supports the draft law and proposes that an article providing for punishment for antistate acts such as strikes should be contained in the law.

At 1300 GMT amendments are proposed concerning the introduction of ration cards.

At 1306 GMT Deputy Liaucius contends that insufficient attention is paid to agriculture in the draft law. It is essential to divert some unemployed people to agriculture during the period of the blockade, he says. Deputy Ambrazaityte supports this idea.

At 1309 GMT deputies Stankevicius and Antanavicius support the draft law with minor amendments.

At 1312 GMT Deputy Razauskas supports the idea of forbidding the export of certain products from the republic.

At 1315 GMT Deputy Serksnys answers some proposals and questions by the deputies. Doubts are expressed on how a vote should be taken concerning the draft law. Serksnys says it is a very important law and has some constitutional implications, so it is essential to decide by what majority of votes it should be passed.

At 1334 GMT Deputy Paleckis makes a statement on anticommunist leaflets distributed in Vilnius.

At 1340 GMT Deputy Uoka describes his visit to Poland to take part in the Solidarity congress.

At 1344 GMT the deputy in the chair reads a list of absent deputies and reasons to justify their absence.

At 1347 GMT the session adjourns until 1430 GMT.

Antiblockade Law Adopted

LD2504153490

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1430 GMT on 25 April resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius. The deputy in the chair states that a corrected draft law on antiblockade measures is to be read.

At 1433 GMT it is announced that elections for a deputy from Naujoji Vilnia will be held in November. The deputy in the chair also outlines the agenda for this week's work by the Supreme Council.

At 1447 GMT questions are asked concerning the appointment of judges to the Supreme Court.

At 1450 GMT a corrected draft law on provisional antiblockade measures is read, followed by discussion of amendments.

At 1458 GMT voting begins on individual amendments. The law on provisional special measures in conditions of the USSR economic blockade is adopted by 87 votes. There are five abstentions and four votes against. No details of the law are provided.

The session and the live relay ends at 1504 GMT.

Prunskiene Addresses 25 Apr Council Session

LD2504174690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0910 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Speech by Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene at the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live]

[Excerpts] Esteemed deputies, the economic blockade that has been going on for seven days already is acquiring a general nature. Not only oil and gas supplies, but also other strategic materials have been disrupted. Normal functioning of the railroads has been impeded, railroad cars are not coming in, and buying gasoline for Lithuanian automobiles outside the territory of Lithuania in other republics of the Soviet Union has been hampered.

The actions of the government in this situation should first of all have a clear strategic basis and should be well organized tactically. I would like to mention here the most important points that I would like to single out among other actions, and to specify the decisions and measures the government has now undertaken and is planning to undertake.

First of all, it is very important for us and the Supreme Council to determine actions further directed at the highest level of the unions—i.e., urging the holding of immediate negotiations, as well as discussing how this can be achieved. [sentence as heard] I would not like to dwell on this question in detail at the moment because after today's meeting this issue will be discussed in specific terms at a joint sitting with the Presidium; there, once again, we will verify our positions, and these and other strategic matters will be discussed.

Second, the strategy of economic relations with the Soviet Union is being further changed: Our actions are now being oriented toward direct links. Later I will specify concrete measures as well.

Third, we are setting up a wide network of contacts in Eastern Europe and Western states. We are preparing some specific actions, and some of these are already being carried out, using these new possibilities that no doubt could be of great importance in the future.

Fourth, within the framework of the internal possibilities of the economy, the blockade must be neutralized: Raw materials that are not supplied must be conserved. Redesignating enterprises, setting up new ways of supplying raw materials while finding new sources—all these points have been discussed today at the sitting of the government.

Neutralizing the consequence of the blockade in the social sphere, both protecting and enriching the consumer market by using available means and ensuring the possibility for the enterprises to pay wages including compensation, starting temporary employment and other measures of control—these will be mentioned separately.

I would like to go over to specific decisions and actions, the practical implementation of which will be reported by Algirdas Brazauskas. [passage omitted]

The Ministry of Material Resources and the Ministry of Trade, together with interested ministries and departments, have been entrusted with the task of taking measures to establish direct trade with republics, cities, and oblasts of the USSR—first of all with the city of Leningrad, Tyumen and Lvov Oblasts, the city of Moscow, and others.

The Ministry of Transportation should ensure the transportation of such goods. I would like to emphasize that specific links have been established with some leaders of these cities, and this week a number of meetings will take place where the possibilities of implementing all these plans will be discussed.

An issue closely related to the situation—regulations on sales of meat, milk, and other food products to the Soviet Union—will be temporarily suspended until the blockade is over. [passage omitted]

I think it has become evident that to continue sending food supplies to Moscow as if nothing had happened when at the same time the Soviet Union has cut off supplies on such a scale would be both politically wrong and wrong for our people. We think we can establish contacts, especially with those cities that are prepared to have direct links with us and where democratic forces are in control of the local situation, such as in Leningrad and

Lvov. We can work to solve the problem of transportation, find ways of settling accounts in kind, in food and other goods, in return for specific goods we need and that have been delivered to us.

Here I would like to point out that payments through the banks have been frozen. This was done earlier. [passage omitted]

We believe it necessary to increase sales of food in Lithuania to the people of the republic in these conditions, while strictly adhering to restrictions on the free export of goods out of the republic. [passage omitted]

We adopted a decision today that the Ministry of Power Engineering should urgently begin reconstructing the Klaipeda enterprise for exporting oil products so it can receive oil products from the sea. Until now the enterprise had functioned only in the opposite direction—exporting oil products.

Strange as it may seem seeing that it imposed the blockade on Lithuania, the Union has not experienced any psychological or political discomfort, since the export of these products continues via the territory of Lithuania to other states. We can look for pretexts, as today has been mentioned, to call this action reconstruction or almost full wear-and-tear of the enterprise so that the enterprise can work in the opposite direction, however, it looks as though we must tell the truth. [passage omitted]

States abroad find it very difficult to see how they can help us in a concrete way. Therefore, even the issue of a ship entering the port of Klaipeda discussed today on a very simple level should be investigated by us and the conditions should be known to us and the states and partners who are prepared to do this [send a tanker] should be informed about these conditions. [passage omitted]

I think the state commission should be engaged in strategic matters concerning the neutralization of the blockade and changing the profile of the economy. [passage omitted] What should our actions be concerning the union at the moment: urging first of all the start of negotiations? What should our attitude be toward free transit of cargo across Lithuania at a time when our cargos are being blocked? Do we respond with similar actions knowing that the consequences of this will lead to another kind of conflict, or do we continue to apply only legal measures, such as in the case of the enterprise in Klaipeda that I have just mentioned? [passage omitted]

The government commission will put the adopted strategy into practice. [passage omitted]

The changed orientation of Lithuania toward the West is essentially connected with overcoming the transportation blockade. Therefore, the port of Klaipeda, which, unfortunately, so far is not controlled by Lithuania, is of great importance. This is a very difficult matter. We must start accelerating actions taken toward Moscow. Virtually a different political precondition is emerging for this, because while blockading us from the East, it is on the whole impossible to find reasons, political or otherwise, that would justify a blockade from the West, of our going out and receiving help. [passage omitted]

Deputy Makes Statement on Anticommunist Leaflets

LD2504171290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1334 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Statement by Deputy Justas Paleckis at the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live]

[Excerpts] During the midday interval I heard from many people via telephone and directly about the small typewritten leaflets distributed in the center of Vilnius, in the old city. Their contents were inciteful and I think the Supreme Council should be informed. The brief content of these leaflets, which I have not seen myself, describes the present situation in the republic. The independent Lithuanian Communist Party is described as the greatest enemy, and its leaders are slandered. Allegedly, the blockade measures have been introduced with their knowledge and support, the Lithuanian Communist Party wishes to make the situation in Lithuania as bad as possible, and other such, to put it mildly, nonsense. [passage omitted]

These leaflets end with an invitation to purge the Lithuanian government of communists. They appeal to all men and women to unite in the Lithuanian Anticommunist Committee. It is signed by the Anticommunist Committee.

Of course, there is no need to attach too great importance to these leaflets. I see motion in the hall, maybe, somebody will be able to supply some information about them. But I would like to draw your attention to the fact that these are not the first attacks in the past few weeks both against deputies and against members of the government. [passage omitted] I wish to repeat once again that the Lithuanian Communist Party is not organizing any intrigues against the legally elected government in which it takes a very active part nor against the leadership of the Supreme Council. It has firmly chosen the path of independence, it is resolved to go together with the nation up to a victorious end. I think that this victory is unavoidable and is not far away. We can courageously look into the eyes of Lithuania's inhabitants and courageously say that we have never betrayed and will never betray their interests. Our thoughts and our efforts are directed at a single aim—to look to optimum ways to consolidate independence, propose its versions, help to implement them, support the legally elected leadership of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, government and be united.

It is not easy today for all of us, but we must endure—there is no other way. It is not the time to look for those guilty because of this state of affairs, but together look for ways of emerging from this situation which would be

acceptable to Lithuania, Europe, and the world. The independent Lithuanian Communist Party will conduct itself only in this way. [passage omitted]

There are grounds to think that this campaign has been started by those forces which failed to gain the support of people in the honorable democratic election struggle, which now attempt to use the present situation and, with provocations, try to drive a wedge between Sajudis and the independent Lithuanian Communist Party at this very complex time. This is very dangerous. Therefore, I ask the leadership of the Lithuanian Supreme Council to thoroughly and everywhere and always defend all deputies and all members of the government, their honor and dignity, and also instruct corresponding institutions to expose the authors of these leaflets and assess the actions of these authors.

Brazauskas Gives Report on Fuel, Railway Blockade

LD2504145290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0940 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Speech by Lithuanian Deputy Prime Minister Algirdas Brazauskas at Lithuanian Supreme Council Session in Vilnius—live]

[Excerpts] Esteemed deputies. [passage omitted] Power resources during the time since I last spoke here have not been replenished. You already know that the oil refinery, employing 3,000 workers, has discontinued production. Crude oil has been refined and its products are being distributed to the republic's consumers. [passage omitted] The system established by us at the very beginning for the use of oil products is still in force; it has not been changed. [passage omitted] I would like to remind you that stocks of oil products are sufficient to last until 20 May. [passage omitted]

The supply of gas has not changed: It amounts to 3.5 million cubic meters in 24 hours. [passage omitted]

Communications are being made difficult by the blockade of the railways. There is a clear order issued to the entire Soviet Union that loads to Lithuania are not to be accepted. Many organizations do not load products, although they would like, and are prepared, to send products to Lithuania. This is one of the most difficult problems today. [passage omitted] The railroad blockade continues.

The method of direct links is being expanded, and this is very good. We have products which are in short supply throughout the Soviet Union—milk, meat and milk products. Of course, we will be able to use them in the same quantity in the future as at present. [passage omitted] I think that the government commission should examine in detail the problem concerning the policy of supplying meat and milk products, and evaluate our possibilities for storing and selling these products. There are certain technological difficulties in storing these products in our cold storage facilities. [passage omitted] We used to send meat to Moscow and Leningrad—roughly 8,000 tonnes to Moscow per month, and over 4,000 tonnes to Leningrad. [passage omitted] I think that we must establish direct links with Leningrad's and Moscow's newly elected executive authorities and attempt to make these mutual beneficial ties.

The affairs of banks and finances: A group which left for Moscow last Sunday has so far not achieved any results. [passage omitted]

There is enough money to pay the April wages without great difficulties, to pay all workers, employees, pensioners, students, and all others who must have the money.

A few words about the supply of food. We have made precise calculations of the main food products. I am not talking about meat and milk—we have enough of these—I am going to talk about imported food products. You know that we used imported grain for high quality flour, bread, groats; we also import sugar, salt, vegetable oil, and margarine. I am not mentioning various sweet products. [passage omitted] With small limitations we have sufficient quantities of these products for two months, for April and May. One of the most difficult situations concerns vegetable oil. The Ukraine has virtually stopped supplying it. [passage omitted]

Maybe we should try to establish ties with individual organizations in the Ukraine, especially with the Ukrainian metallurgical combines. We obtain 40 percent of all metal from the Ukraine.

The next problem I would like to describe briefly is wasted time. [passage omitted] Yesterday afternoon about 7,500 industrial workers were idle. According to forecasts based on the shortage of raw materials like rubber, glue, various products—I cannot name them all even though the list is not a long one—but 85,000 workers will be idle by 1 May. There is news that yesterday the Union's Council of Ministers adopted a decision not to supply Lithuania with paper or with raw materials for the furniture industry. Thus we are facing great problems with the poroduction of paper and cardboard. [passage omitted]

There are transportation difficulties, but the situation is not critical. [passage omitted] However, even a small six-seven percent reduction in routes creates difficulties and inconvenience for our residents. [passage omitted] In agriculture, although there is no great problem, thousands of tractors and vehicles are idle because of their poor state of repair and a shortage of spare parts, and not necessarily because of a shortage of fuel. But the situation is not critical. [passage omitted]

Housing construction combines: Today a problem arose in connection with the fact that we are short of armatures and metal. All stocks are coming to an end, and on 1 May, housing construction combines will stop work. [passage omitted] The Vilnius combine, the largest in the republic, is facing the greatest danger; it employs many

people. Other combines in Kaunas, Klaipeda, and Siauliai will also suffer shortages. [passage omitted]

I wish to assure everyone that each motorist will receive his monthly ration of 30 liters of gasoline.

Lithuanian Supreme Council Agenda Published

LD2504174090 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1443 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Agenda for Lithuanian Supreme Council work as read by A. Absilas chairing the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius- - live]

[Summary] Thursday, 26 April, there will be work in commissions.

Friday and Saturday, 27 and 28 April, council members will meet with the electorate.

Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday, 29 April-1 May, citizens of the republic will be received.

Wednesday, 2 May, there will be a plenary session at 0900 GMT to discuss the following:
draft law on enterprises of the republic of Lithuania
draft law on state control, and
law on the rights of repressed persons who resisted the occupational regime.

Thursday, 3 May, high court judges will be elected, starting at 0700 GMT and concluding by 1530 GMT.

On Wednesday, 2 May, there will be a sitting of the chairman of permanent commissions at 0700 GMT.

Moscow Radio Reports on Economic Blockade

LD2504162290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] [Announcer] Every day we tell our listeners about the news from Lithuania, about the situation in that republic. Today will be no exception. So over to Lithuania, with Elyana Kurkletite on the line. Tell us about today, please.

[Kurkletite] The session of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic is continuing its work. The deputies are discussing antiblockade measures. Incidentally, about the term economic blockade—one of the deputies asked whether what is happening should not perhaps be called economic sanctions. Algirdas Brazauskas replied to this by saying that this is a most real economic blockade because what is now involved is not only the cessation of oil and gas deliveries, but also the cessation of deliveries of various raw materials, products, and even medicines, and a blockade of the rail and road transportation which brings all of this cargo in. A state commission for the preparation of antiblockade measures was confirmed yesterday. The deputies appointed Kazimiera Prunskiene chairperson of this commission. The aim of the commission's work is to prepare laws and standards for the blockade period, and to urgently adopt strategic measures for putting the economy in order.

[Announcer] How would you describe the strategy of the government of Lithuania on these issues at the moment.

[Kurkletite] The government is attempting to go over to direct ties with enterprises and organizations in the Soviet Union, and a search is being conducted for a solution to the main problem—transportation. The port of Klaipeda is being reconstructed to take oil and petroleum products. A group of specialists is preparing to make a trip to the United States, Canada, Scandinavian countries, and other foreign states with specific powers and with packages of proposals. It was stated at a session of Lithuania's government that it is necessary to achieve a situation where the USSR Ministry of Railways does not blockade rail operations. That goes beyond the measures officially announced by the USSR Government.

As I have already said, it is being recommended to enterprises that they expand their direct ties, bearing in mind the republic's needs. It was stated at the session that many necessary resources and products can be obtained in the Soviet Union in exchange for meat and dairy products. The Ministry of Social Security has already prepared measures for finding people the necessary work, safeguarding a subsistence standard of living, and paying wages. Incidentally, an aid fund account has been opened at the Social Bank in Vilnius. Sums of money are already coming in from enterprises, public organizations, and private individuals.

[Announcer] Elyana, what is very important is how the ordinary inhabitants of Lithuania, the workers, are reacting to the situation which has been created.

[Kurkletite] You know, opinions differ, but I have in my hand the results of a new Gallup sociological study in Lithuania, which they made on the basis of Vilnius University's sociological research laboratory from 1 to 10 April. I will talk about this a little later, however.

Here is the opinion of Liucijus Kondratas, chairman of the labor collective of the Plasta Works in Vilnius. It was published in the Russian-Language newspaper EKHO LITVY today. I quote:

The opinion of the absolute majority is unambiguous: one should not fall prey to panic under any circumstances. And discipline at the enterprises has become even stronger. The workers have themselves submitted decisions: Those guilty of theft or drunkenness in the workplace are to be fired. Their opinion was supported by the trade union: Calm and endurance are our principles.

[Announcer] I am interested to know how many unemployed there are in the republic? Is there such data?

[Kurkletite] Yes. Algirdas Brazauskas reported at the Supreme Soviet session that 7,500 workers in industry

alone have been made unemployed. According to preliminary forecasts, 35,000 to 40,000 workers will be unemployed by 1 May due to the lack of raw materials. As was announced at the Supreme Soviet session today, this figure may rise even more sharply because there are reports that timber deliveries are halting, which means that Lithuania's furniture industry and construction work are coming to a halt. Contractual deliveries of other products have ceased, too.

[Announcer] Well, you still wanted to return to the results of the study by the Gallup Institute.

[Kurkletite] I will remind our listeners that the results of the Gallup sociological studies which were conducted in Lithuania on 24 February were also published in the central newspapers. The new study of 1 to 10 April provides evidence of the following: 79 percent, or four-fifths, of those polled see their future in the independent Lithuanian state. Thirty percent of Lithuanians expect help from Western states, but they are also hoping for help from democratic forces in the Soviet Union—there are 32 percent of those. In the section on the policies of Lithuania and the world, Algirdas Brazauskas remains the most popular person. His marks even increased from February to April: now he has 93 percent. After Brazauskas, Pope John Paul II is the most popular person in Lithuania, and Vytautas Landsbergis, the chairman of Lithuania's Supreme Soviet, is in third place.

That is the news from Lithuania.

[Announcer] Well, the results of those studies are interesting, but I nevertheless want to remind listeners that half a month has gone by since they were conducted. Life may have made some amendments over that half a month.

Stoppages Due to Fuel Shortage Reported

PM2504150490 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent Aleksandr Protsenko article under the "Direct Line" rubric: "What Declarations Are Worth"]

[Text] Vilnius—It has been announced in Lithuania that because of the shortage of energy resources radio and television broadcasting hours are being cut. Several bus routes have been canceled in the republic capital—there is no gas. Personal motor transport is "laid up."

And the speculators have sprung into action—drivers say that on Monday they were asking R25 for a can (25 liters) of gas, and on Tuesday—R50. It was announced on local television that criminal proceedings are being taken against 19 people for stealing fuel.

On her return from a tour of Scandinavian countries Prime Minister K. Prunskiene was appointed chairman of the antiblockade commission—a special organ of power made up of members of the Lithuanian parliament and government. The commission has been given emergency powers and its decisions are binding on all Lithuania's enterprises, organizations, and inhabitants.

The state commission is not yet fully in possession of the facts on the situation in the republic. At a press conference journalists received no precise answers on which Lithuanian enterprises have already been halted because of the reduction in deliveries of raw and other materials from the USSR or on how many people are out of work. According to information received from the Lithuanian Council of Ministers, only the Mazheykyay oil refinery has stopped work entirely, the "Azot" Combine is working at one-third capacity, and one shop at the "Plasta" Association has been halted, as have several production units and a number of small plants and factories. From 1 May, by all appearances, a whole series of the republic's industrial enterprises will be halted. Even today the number of people unemployed because of production stoppages is in excess of 7,500. At many enterprises workers have been told to consider taking leave at their own expense. Food industry enterprises are working as usual, but they are finding it increasingly difficult to deliver raw materials and convey output to the trade network—their motor transport is also without fuel.

It was also said at the press conference that unless the situation changes approximately one-half of Lithuania's urban population could find itself without work or wages. But in the countryside—because of the shortage of energy resources—the amount of work is increasing. Fuel stocks in Lithuania today are estimated to be sufficient for a week at most.

Timber, Paper Shortage

LD2604094990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] According to an order of the USSR Ministry of Timber Industry, the supply of all timber products has been stopped to Lithuania's timber and paper industry enterprises. The Klaipeda cellulose and cardboard factory, which has recently undergone major overhaul, has stocks of timber and fuel sufficient for four to five days. The Klaipeda enterprise is the only one in the Soviet Union producing cardboard for the match industry. The head of the Inter-Branch Relations Board at the Union Ministry has implored that the enterprise should work at least for another month supplying products for the manufacture of matches.

Unfortunately, Moscow's policy will make life miserable to many people. According to the enterprise's director, there is only one way—establish relations with Western firms.

A critical situation has also arisen in supplying the press with paper and other materials. It is estimated that stocks of paper for publication of the main newspapers will last roughly for 10 days. The stocks of polygraphic dyes, photographic films, and offset process forms are

also very limited. Various USSR enterprises refuse to supply them, and the railwaymen prevent their transporation.

At today's meeting of representatives of newspapers and magazines with heads of the Lithuanian enterprise Spauda, it was proposed from the beginning of May to reduce the volume of newspapers and magazines, their periodicity, and to temporarily stop the publication of departmental newspapers. This week we are going to get normal newspapers, and from the next week—blockade papers. The publication of the MARZOJI LIETUVA FORUM [LITTLE LITHUANIA FORUM], SAVAITES EKRANAS [WEEKLY SCREEN], and other weeklies is discontinued. The ATGIMIMAS and LITERATURA IR MENAS will be published every second week. The daily RESPUBLIKA will be published three times a week, LIETUVOS RYTAS—four times.

Health Service Affected

LD2604100790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] Lithuania's economic blockade has affected vital interests of Lithuania's people. A representative of the Ministry of Health has announced that it intends to admit fewer people to hospitals. Medical institutions have been short of medicines, but at present more limits have to be introduced. Medical workers are compelled to reduce the number of preventive examinations. Only the most essential laboratory research will be carried out. The quantity of medicines and number of injections is being reduced.

Lithuania Blockade Creates Latvia Shortages

LD2604090290 Vilnius International Service in English 2200 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] The blockage of oil supplies to Lithuania has affected Latvia as well. (?The) minister of heat and oil supply reported that 70 percent of petrol supplies comes from Mazeikiai oil processing plant, blockage of which put the republic in a difficult situation. Negotiations (?have) started about the oil supply from other oil processing plants in the Soviet Union but for the time being restrictions have been imposed on drivers: 50 liters of petrol [gasoline] per month are given to truck drivers and food suppliers, as well (?as persons) who are fulfilling all the needs of agricultural work in spring in the countryside. (?And) it's a total stop for petrol [gasoline] to private car owners. The only exception is [word indistinct] workers and handicapped people who own a car.

Shortages in Lithuania Will Affect USSR

LD2504224190 Vilnius International Service in English 2200 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] Lithuania has been living under the conditions of an economic blockade already for a week. The resources of energy are drying up and Lithuania's largest cement plant in north Lithuania will be able to operate only till the end of this month. The stoppage of the plant will materialize for the Soviet Union into a daily loss of R15 million as the plant supplies cement to a number of Soviet republics.

The administration of the plant is receiving telegrams from Soviet partners saying that enterprises in Russia are sending their protests to Moscow in which they demand to lift the blockade of Lithuania. Moscow, Leningrad, the Ukraine, as well as other regions of the USSR, would like to cooperate with Lithuania on an exchange basis, yet the blockade of the railway presents an essential obstacle. [as heard].

The Lithuanian government has received telegrams from factories in several Russian districts assuring that they will strictly observe their commitments. Lithuania is determined to reciprocate with regard to these enterprises.

The situation in supplying the printing houses with paper is becoming critical as the main Lithuanian dailies expect to last on the present resources only 10 days more. Starting with May, newspapers and magazines will come out thinner and at wider intervals between the issues.

Power Strengthened To React to Economic Blockade

LD2604092990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0800 GMT 26 Apr 90

[Excerpts] The leadership of the USSR has started and is escalating the economic blockade of Lithuania, thus violating USSR laws on economy and the contractual agreements signed according to these laws. Therefore, with the aim of ensuring the vital needs of the people of Lithuania, the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania, given the conditions of economic blockade, has decided:

1. To grant powers to the government of the republic of Lithuania to change the plans for production and supply of goods of state and cooperative enterprises, and to abrogate or suspend economic agreements exempting payment of fines for failure to carry out contractual obligations. [passage omitted]

Material and financial resources including hard currency belonging to local self-government, state, and state-cooperative enterprises and organizations must be used in a centralized way.

Rationing of vital commodities must be implemented, including the introduction of ration cards.

In case of need, people must be transferred to other jobs [passage omitted]

2. To ban the export of goods and raw materials out of Lithuania without government permission. [passage omitted]

3. Decisions of the state antiblockade commission must be carried out by the government of the republic of Lithuania. [passage omitted]

Military Paper Disputes Results of Blockade

PM2604111590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Apr 90 First Edition p 1

[Lieutenant Colonel O. Falichev report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "The 'Blockade' and... the Ministers"]

[Text] Vilnius—More and more the vocabulary of Lithuanian parliamentary sessions and press conferences reminds you of reports from a front: "blockade," "blow," "breakthrough"...

For example, parliament was discussing the question of creating a so-called antiblockade commission to be headed by Prime Minister K. Prunskiene. What will the commission's job be? As commission member S. Stankjavicus stated, it will be to seek solutions to ease the impact of the blockade. As for the measures planned by the government, they can hardly be called constructive. They include, among other things, exploring for and developing its own oil deposits on the continental shelf and converting enterprises. This at the moment is pure fantasy.

V. Capajtis, a member of the republic's parliament, has talked about the possibility of applying unpopular measures. They are: sending townspeople who have lost their jobs to country regions, introducing ration cards, and so forth. You get the impression that some people in the government do not fully appreciate the gravity of the crisis into which they are leading Lithuania. After all, two factories, the Mazheyskiy oil refinery, and other enterprises have already stopped work and workers' pay is falling.

This is in sharp contrast to those who are actually living quite well in the "blockade." As a DAILY MAIL correspondent quite accurately noted at a press conference, not everyone is in the same boat. For example, ministers are reluctant to lose their privileges. Despite the general gasoline shortage they continue to travel to and from work in their own cars, some even as far as Kaunas.

Lithuanian Economic Situation Said Worsening

LD2604063390 Moscow TASS in English 0617 GMT 26 Apr 90

[By TASS special correspondent Boris Zverev]

[Text] Vilnius April 26 TASS—"From now on the economic situation in Lithuania can only get worse," a senior Lithuanian economic official told TASS, as the republic's economy plunged further into crisis due to shortages of raw materials previously supplied by the Soviet Union.

"Our stocks are helping us make do, but they are running low," Albinas Jaovarauskas, a member of the newly formed parliamentary commission on anti-blockade measures, told TASS.

According to Soviet statistics, 98 per cent of Lithuanian industries depend on consumers and suppliers in the Soviet Union.

The republic consumes 1.2 million tonnes of petroleum, 1.5 million tonnes of diesel fuel and 2.9 million tonnes of residual fuel every year.

A total of 5.5 million tonnes of oil are required annually to produce this amount of fuel.

Lithuania paid 35 roubles for a tonne of Soviet oil. It will have to pay about 200 dollars a tonne on the world market. They will require more than 50 million dollars a month to pay for fuel they so badly need, foreign experts say.

Up to 10 per cent of all industrial enterprises in the republic will have to be shut down in the next few days, Jaovarauskas said.

Many plants have stopped for repairs now and workers are going on leave, he said, stressing the need for a political compromise.

"If we consider ourselves a separate state, we have to find points of mutual advantage with the state on which the well-being of our people depends," he said.

The finale of the episode is not far off, according to Gennadiy Vasiliyev, economic adviser to the pro-Moscow Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee.

Forty-six of the 400 Lithuanian enterprises have already been shut down, he told TASS.

"Besides, panic among the population is mounting, the people are afraid of hunger, and have begun hoarding food and other goods," he said.

Vasilyev said Lithuania will be unable to produce the necessary guarantees to obtain western credits.

The government can only strike political deals with the West, he said.

Lithuanian Commission Views Economic Situation

LD2604121590 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1005 GMT 26 Apr 90

[Text] The Lithuanian government commission on the adjustment of the economic situation met this morning at 0900. Leaders of the republican power economy complex, food industry, trade and other economic branches presented reports. Many Lithuanian representatives have gone to various republics and regions and to Eastern European countries with practical proposals on economic ties.

The commission discussed paper conservation and the possibility of producing newsprint in Lithuanian factories. It was decided to sell some food and other products without labels and reduce the production of these labels. Republican paper suppliers and producers were instructed to prepare detailed information on existing opportunities by this evening.

The heads of the food industry appealed to all trade and other organizations to return as soon as possible empty packages—wooden and cardboard cases, glass and metal articles.

A sales boom is taking place in towns. In many shops daily allocations of goods are sold instantly, especially groceries. Trade Minister Albertas Sinevicius said 80 percent of food product stocks are still in wholesale and retail bases. By 1 May these goods will be distributed to shops strictly in accordance with daily limits. Additional coupons are being produced. From 1 May they will be introduced for some food products. Their norms per capita have been calculated based on a comparison with average consumption last May.

The construction of production objects has been discontinued. All building materials are directed to the construction of housing, social, and ecological objects.

Antiblockade measures proposed by the inhabitants on yesterday's television program Atgimimo Banga were discussed in a preliminary manner.

Presidential Council Member on Lithuanian Events

LD2504181290 Moscow TASS in English 1744 GMT 25 Apr 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow April 25 TASS—"Talks between Moscow and Vilnius on Lithuania's secession can begin only if Lithuania withdraws to 'the March 10 line', i.e. the day before Lithuania proclaimed independence. The search for a formula to 'save the face' may be left to the discretion of Lithuanian leaders", TASS was told by Presidential Council member Yevgeniy Primakov.

The member of the country's supreme leadership pointed to the possiblity of a political settlement and said "the declaration of independence may be torn up or it may be put in a desk drawer and temporarily suspended".

Primakov described as "not serious" the policy pursued by the present Lithuanian leadership. "Crucial decisions that affect not only the fate of perestroyka in the Soviet Union but also stability in the world cannot be taken all of a sudden", he stressed.

"The Lithuanian leadership's sally looks even more strange against the background of new laws promulgated by the Soviet parliament, which radically change the very nature of relations between the centre and the republics", Primakov said.

"If before relations were based solely on the principle of universality, henceforth a differentiated approach will be applied. In other words, connections with the Baltic region can differ in character from those with other republics."

Reaction in the Soviet Union to the Lithuanian declaration of secession was far from uniform, Primakov said. "The overwhelming majority of the country's population did not applaud the move, and President Gorbachev, frankly speaking, has had to restrain many people," the Presidential Council member said.

Primakov said he did not agree with the opinion now circulating in Lithuania that "50 years within the Soviet Union gave nothing to the republic".

"Lithuania received more from the centre, especially during recent years, than any other republic," he said. "It turned from a poor country with scattered farmsteads into a republic with a highly-developed economy". While in the Soviet Union, it was given additional territory, including five regions from Belorussia.

"We condemn the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact as strongly as Lithuanians do, but it remains a fact that as a result of that pact Lithuania received Vilnius and the adjacent territory," Primakov said. The port of Klaipeda was ceded to the Soviet Union as a result of World War II and was then handed over to Lithuania.

As a result, it is perplexing that the Lithuanian leaders argue in favour of secession by alleging that the documents on Lithuania's incorportation into the Soviet Union, dating back fifty years, were illegal. "The absolutely unfair Russo-German Treaty of Brest- Lotovsk signed 70 years ago might likewise be proclaimed illegal and then it would be considered that Lithuania never left our state".

"Taking into account the actual situation in the country it can be stated that Moscow has been pursuing a most flexible policy with regard to Lithuania," Primakov said.

As concerns the "economic blockade" of Lithuania, it simply does not exist, he stressed. "The phrase is a hyperbole used by journalists succumbing to the temptation of using a catch-phrase". A blockade means closed borders, but-off supplies of electirc power and foodstuffs—there is nothing of this kind. Moreover, Moscow has had to make additional efforts to maintain economic links at an adequate level while mistrust in Lithuanian partners is growing among enterprises in other regions of the country".

The Soviet leadership cannot be indifferent to violations of human rights in Lithuania, Primakov said. He called "utterly undemocratic: the practice of granting Lithuanian citizenship only to people whose political sympathies coincide with those of the present Lithuanian leadership. No civilised country in the world conditions citizenship on the renunciation of opposition to government, he stressed.

No one is going to retain Lithuania by force, Primakov said. Even the most trusted marriages sometimes fall apart. "But the divorse must be performed as it is accepted among civilised people—be it a marriage blessed by the church, a secular marriage or cohabitation".

Lithuania Economic Crimes on Increase

LD2504222990 Vilnius International Service in English 2200 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] As the spokesman of the Lithuanian Interior Ministry said on television tonight, the number of crimes directly associated with the economic blockade is going up, especially cases of petrol theft in countryside petrol stations and cases of draining the petrol tanks of parked cars in the broad daylight. An increase of looting small shops in remote areas was also reported.

Legal Aspects of Lithuania Situation Viewed

LD2504201690 Moscow TASS in English 1948 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 25 TASS—"Tendencies towards establishing a dictatorship are more in evidence in Lithuania today," Professor Vsevolod Kuritsyn, doctor of science (law), told TASS.

"This is inevitable because a considerable part of the people does not support the government, considering that their interests are infringed upon or will be infringed. Take a law on citizenship, for instance. Nowhere in the world a person has to take the oath of loyalty to government in receiving citizenship or a passport. Several other legislative acts restrict citizens' rights on ethnic grounds."

"The right to self-determination is the legitimate right of each nation in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. To object to this means to contradict the law. The implementation of this right, however, requires a constitutional procedure to define the rights of the Russian-speaking population and ensure the rights of those people who do not wish to remain on Lithuanian territory and will move to other areas," Kuritsyn observed.

"It is also necessary that the interests of all the rest Soviet republics be protected as they are bound by mutual commitments, mutual settlements and mutual supplies. The entire range of links- - we have lived in the single economic market for 50 years—should be settled."

Speaking about the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact, Kuritsyn called it immoral. "A legal issue prompts itself here. Vilnius territory, which is known to be part of Poland earlier, was incorporated into the USSR under a secret supplement to the pact. Only after this, the USSR turned it over to the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic].

"If Lithuanians now say that all consequences of this pact should be eliminated, what about Vilnius territory then? This territory acceded to the USSR and then to the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic in accordance with this supplement. The present Lithuanian Government has not answered this question as yet."

"The Lithuanian leadership's thesis 'we do not need to secede from the USSR because we did not enter it' is also disputable. The decision on Lithuania's entry into the USSR was made by the parliament which was elected before the republic entered into the USSR. Therefore, from the legal point of view, these documents are valid. The act on the entry was supported by the considerable majority of the population. News-reels, the press, archive documents and the literature of that time corroborate this," Kuritsyn said.

Journalist Interviewed on Lithuanian Coverage

90UN1551C Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 12 Apr 90 p 2

[Interview with Petr Orlov, correspondent of the "Vremya" program of USSR Central Television by ELTA correspondent S. Arvasiavicius: "Central Television—an Advocate of Minorities?"]

[Text] Petr Orlov, correspondent of the "Vremya" information program on USSR Central Television has filed many reports on Lithuania. Many of them portrayed events in Lithuania quite tendentiously. Is this the position of a journalist or an order "from on high?" This is what we discussed with P. Orlov.

[Arvasiavicius] What is your assessment of your reports on Lithuania?

[Orlov] As any journalist, I am satisfied after completing a job. Sometimes it turns out better, sometimes worse. If a report does not turn out right I blame myself only, but I try to do everything honestly.

[Arvasiavicius] Do the editors in Moscow frequently take material out of your reports?

[Orlov] You know yourself how this is done. At times, you have to prove to the management that you are right, but this is a part of normal work for a journalist...

[Arvasiavicius] Are you sure that the USSR mass media will cover events in the republic in exactly the same manner when the independence of Lithuania is recognized?

[Orlov] This is an extraordinarily complex question... Possibly some journalists will acknowledge that they were wrong, but a majority will feel no pangs of conscience because they carried out an order. This is why the editorial offices of TASS, Central Television, PRAVDA, or others will not blush. It is also important how the independence of Lithuania will affect the life of the people. I mainly paid attention to how the fact of proclaiming Lithuania's independence was perceived by the residents of Lithuania, rather than the fact itself.

[Arvasiavicius] However, one feels that there is a quite categorical and clear answer in your reports...

[Orlov] There is politics, there is the law, but it is important to take moral factors into account as well when you analyze a specific situation. The degree of social justice in a state is determined by how the interests of all minorities are protected rather than by how the majority lives. Meanwhile, the interests of the minority in Lithuania are infringed upon.

[Arvasiavicius] However, with regard to the USSR the Lithuanian people are exactly the minority you could defend! Nonetheless, for now the interests of minorities are defended in the USSR mass media in a very abstract manner, with the exception of the minority consisting of the top echelon of the partocracy.

[Orlov] However, much to my disappointment, the current situation in Lithuania is very far from ideal.

[Arvasiavicius] Recently, the results of sociological surveys were released in Lithuania: Ninety-one percent of those polled came out in favor of the Lithuanian independence. Are you going to refer to these data in your reports?

[Orlov] Yes, because I believe that they reflect actual reality.

[Arvasiavicius] Will this not contradict the Central Television position?

[Orlov] I use these data, but it is in the jurisdiction of specific people to make them public.

[Arvasiavicius] What is your assessment of the actions of the Soviet Army aimed at seizing civilian buildings, the acts of violence against the citizens of Lithuania in hospitals, and the show of force?

[Orlov] The army should be neutral, especially in regions which are that sensitive. This is why I can say safely that the behavior of the Soviet Army in Lithuania is improper in many cases. However, USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] personnel defend the USSR Constitution in Lithuania, and this is quite normal.

[Arvasiavicius] In your opinion, who should the facilities which are now occupied by the USSR MVD soldiers be defended against?

[Orlov] ...Still, you would agree that the MVD soldiers are better than the Soviet Army.

[Arvasiavichius] How do you like the policy of glasnost of the USSR Government whereby foreign citizens and journalists have been asked to leave Lithuania, and those wishing to come are not being given visas?

[Orlov] We, the Soviet journalists, will furnish more information to the foreign countries on the events in Lithuania. This is why I believe that the world will know what is happening here.

[Arvasiavicius] Time and the program of the same name [Vremya—time] will tell whether Petr Orlov is going to abide by these principles.

Deputies Unable To Reach Soviet Officials

LD2504222590 Vilnius International Service in English 2200 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] As is known, for the third day a delegation of Lithuanian MP's [members of parliament] headed by Deputy Chairman of the Supreme Council Bronius Kuzmickas has been trying to contact Soviet officials on the issue of consultations.

Today Romas Gudaitis and Yurate Kuplyauskene, USSR people's deputies, managed to talk briefly to Nikolay Ryzhkov during a break at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The Soviet premier, however, did not wish to enter upon any polemics. He only reaffirmed that both his stand and that of the whole government with regard to Lithuania remains categoric. According to (?a) [word indistinct] correspondent, there was an exchange of harsh words on both sides during the talk.

Ryzhkov Interviewed on Lithuania, Economy

LD2504182190 Moscow World Service in English 1710 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] Radio Moscow's Supreme Soviet correspondent has interviewed Prime Minister Ryzhkov in the Kremlin on the situation in Lithuania and the future of the Soviet economy. The political deadlock over Lithuania has been worsening. What does Prime Minister Ryzhkov think of the situation in that republic and the position taken by its leaders?

[Begin Ryzhkov recording, in Russian with superimposed English translation] One must have the courage to recognize mistakes and to find some flexible formula. I believe that the current Lithuanian leaders must be doing precisely that. They cannot keep saying no. There is no such word in the diplomatic vocabulary. They must think that over again. [end recording]

Nikolay Ryzhkov confirmed the Soviet leadership's position to the effect that the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania must restore the situation that existed on 10th March, that is before Lithuania's independence was proclaimed.

What does he think of the United States attitude to the Lithuanian situation?

[Begin Ryzhkov recording] I believe that President Bush has taken a very realistic decision. After consultations in Congress, President Bush said that the United States will impose no economic sanctions or other measures against the Soviet Union. Should that process begin, it will not lead to anything good. Other countries, too, have reacted rather coolly in political terms. They say once the Lithuanians want to separate, that process must go on. We have been saying just the same. There is the USSR Constitution; let's follow it. We don't need any demonstrations. [end recording]

Prime Minister Ryzhkov believes the situation in Lithuania and all the accompanying factors must not interfere with the forthcoming meeting of the United States and Soviet leaders.

Nikolay Ryzhkov also answered questions concerning the government's future report about efforts to give a boost to the economic reform in the USSR. How different are these measures from the ones already taken to improve the USSR's economic system?

[Begin Ryzhkov recording] We have continued to build up from our own program. We keep developing and specifying it. This is not a new program. We must gradually introduce new principles of operation and we have been working on that. We have already discussed the program at the Presidential Council. I have been meeting with economics experts and industrial managers. In a word, we have been testing everything. Indeed, we cannot launch a program that would make the standard of living decline. [end recording]

When will the program be presented to parliament?

[Begin Ryzhkov recording] I will do that in May. I will present a package of measures for the further development of the economic reform and for the transition to a controlled market already in 1991. [end recording]

Are there any other opinions of how to develop the country's economy?

[Begin Ryzhkov recording] The opinions of scholars, industrial managers and members of the Presidential Council vary. I believe that there must be a smooth turn. I have always sought balanced options. We must avoid taking a road that would lead to serious instability in the economy. Before we move forward we must look into every step we are going to take. I am against experiments leading nowhere. [end recording]

We have brought you the highlights of an interview with the Soviet prime minister Nikolay Ryzhkov.

Appeal From Informal Groups Supports Lithuania

90UN1572B Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian
31 Mar 90 p 3

["Appeal" from informal movements]

[Text] **The appeal was adopted at the meeting of the Civic Action Committee on 24 March 1990, in whose work people's deputies of the USSR and RSFSR [Russian Soviet Socialist Republic] participated—members of the interregional group of deputies and the Democratic Russia bloc—and representatives of social organizations—the Democratic Platform in the CPSU; the social democratic association, Memorial; the MOSCOW TRIBUNE; the voters club of the USSR Academy of Sciences; the Nevada society; the Armenian National Movement; the Azerbaijan Social Democratic Party; the Association of Voters and Deputies of Bashkiria; the Berlik Society; the Rustaveli Society; the Azerbaijan People's Front; the Green movement; and others.**

We understand and respect the restoration of state independence to Lithuania, regarding it as the exercise of the inalienable right of the people to self-determination, the restoration of historical justice with respect to this country whose sovereignty was trampled upon as a result of a criminal pact between Stalin and Hitler. Wishing for all peoples of the Lithuanian state to flourish under the conditions of peace and democracy, we hope that this act will not foreordain either a break or even a weakening of the multilateral economic and cultural ties between Lithuania and the USSR based on equality and mutual advantage, or difficulties in personal contacts among citizens of the two states either.

Everything depends on the good will and wisdom of the leadership of the USSR and the Lithuanian Republic, on the mutual benevolence and composure of the Lithuanians, Russians, Belorussians, Poles, and representatives of other nationalities both in Lithuania and outside it. There are no problems that cannot be resolved here and there is no need to artificially stir them up.

Guided by these convictions we make the following suggestions:

1. The Supreme Soviet and president of the USSR should recognize the independence of the Lithuanian state and take measures to restore relations with them with equal rights.

2. The president's ukase of 21 March 1990, "On Additional Measures for Securing the Rights of Soviet citizens and Preserving the Sovereignty of the USSR on the Territory of Lithuania," should be rescinded because it is not constructive, is in line with the old political thinking, and objectively can only increase ethnic tension both in Lithuania and in the republics of the Soviet Union.

3. The president and government of the USSR, the presidium of the Supreme Council, government, and parliament of the Lithuanian Republic should immediately begin negotiations directed toward preserving the stability of existing national economic ties, solving problems of citizenship, and regulation of property relations and financial, transportation, and other issues to the satisfaction of both sides.

4. We appeal to the Lithuanian people, for whom we have a sense of deep respect and solidarity, and the parliament of Lithuania, on whom a great deal depends today, to do everything possible to make sure that the acquisition of state independence does not lead to the slightest encroachment on the democratic rights and interests of representatives of other ethnic groups so that in an independent Lithuania along with Lithuanians, Russians and Belorussians, Poles and Jews, Tatars and people of all other nationalities who have linked their destiny to it will be able to feel equally at home. In turn, we call for the non-Lithuanian part of the republic's population to be understanding and have faith in the

changes taking place there and to participate in them in an active and democratic way. The main thing now is not to let national suspicion and hostility get the upper hand. National harmony is the most important condition for the success of sovereign Lithuania and the peace and well-being of its residents. The peaceful democratic development of Lithuania is an important condition for the victory of democracy in the Soviet Union.

Trade Union Protests Policy on Working Days

LD2504102790 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1700 GMT 24 Apr 90

[Text] Here is a statement of the Estonian Central Union of Trade Unions:

The Estonian Central Union of Trade Unions does not consider it correct in principle to change days off into working days, even with the ensuing compensation. As a result, workers have to work seven consecutive days without a day off. Proceeding from the above, we express protest over two days—28 and 29 April 1990—being changed into working days.

The statement has been signed by Siim Kallas on behalf of the Estonian Central Union of Trade Unions.

Landsbergis, Others Speak at Vilnius Rally

90UN1553A Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 10 Apr 90 pp 1, 3

[Report by EKHO LITVY correspondents J. Mazeikis and R. Guiga: "Vingis Park: Jam-Packed"]

[Text] Perhaps, Vingis Park had never before held as many people as last Saturday. Right after dinner the people came here in family groups and in entire collectives. Passenger cars and buses with stenciled signs showing that the buses had brought people from Kaunas, Alitus, Klaipeda, Mazeikiai, and Skuodas—in a word, from all of Lithuania were lined up on adjacent streets. The people kept arriving, and for the first time a large square failed to hold them. Both the green knolls and the walkways were taken up by the people who came here and did not mind spending their spare time to once again express their approval of the decisions made by the republic of Lithuania Supreme Council and discuss the appeal of the USSR President M.S. Gorbachev to the people of Lithuania.

Leader of the meeting A. Zebriunas, member of the Seim Council of "Sajudis" and movie director, addressed those assembled: "Esteemed people of Lithuania, it has already become a tradition for the people of Lithuania to gather here at a difficult and joyful time for us. We gather in order to express our approval or outrage, in order to share our joy or sorrow, in order to ask and listen to our neighbors. Dear people of Lithuania, your voice will be heard extensively, not only in the adjacent republics but the world over. Let all the people know about our hopes and aspirations."

V. Landsbergis, chairman of the republic of Lithuania Supreme Council, who was greeted by stormy applause approached the microphone. His speech was interrupted three times by the buzz of a military helicopter flying very low over this huge crowd of people (God forbid, there might have been an accident). This sortie by the uninvited guests did not impress those gathered in the manner which, I think, the organizers of this action had hoped for.

V. Landsbergis called on the people to remain calm not only at moments like this but also at the most complex moments which, undoubtedly, are yet to come.

V. Landsbergis said: "Nobody will make us repudiate our decisions, nobody will take away from us the freedom which we have won with such difficulty. This is our land, and we want to be free here! Lithuania is gradually gaining the sympathy of the entire world. It may not be clearly expressed for now, but it still shows that we are not alone anymore. The world is changing very rapidly, and we are proceeding toward our future together with it. The future belongs to us," assured V. Landsbergis.

Perhaps, the form of address "dear people of Lithuania" was used most frequently at this rally. These words were heard in the speeches of R. Gudaitis and A. Smailis, M. Laurinkus and J. Paleckis, and many others. This form of address reflects the essence very well: It is addressed to all people of good will regardless of their nationality, religion, and education.

The struggle for freedom has its own traditions and its own logic in each case. If someone cannot understand the logic in keeping with which the events in our republic have been unfolding let us sit down at the negotiating table and discuss everything. We are certain that common ground will be found. We are certain that toward the end of the 20th century wisdom and tolerance will prevail rather than force—this was the motif of many speeches. Also, there was confidence and hope that solving problems, perhaps, not those of the first order, through violence is not characteristic of the person who has been up to the tremendous labors of perestroyka, namely, President M.S. Gorbachev.

A. Zebriunas invited to the microphone a guest from Moscow, Yu. Afanasyev, USSR people's deputy and member of the Interregional Group of Deputies.

Yu. Afanasyev said: "We have come here together with A. Murashov in order to support the decisions the republic of Lithuania Supreme Council made on 11 March. One does not have to be a very astute politician in order to see that this decision represents the will of the people. Some more time will pass, and 11 March will signify the beginning of the end of the Russian Empire because it is impossible to go on living the way we have been for many decades!"

Toward the end of his speech, People's Deputy Yu. Afanasyev offered assurances that the democratic forces

will be more persistent in helping the people of Lithuania preserve their independence.

Second grader (unfortunately, they did not announce from which school) G. Filimonova made a distinctive contribution to this serious discussion by adults. Having expressed her gratitude for being given the floor, she read her poem in response to USSR President M.S. Gorbachev. What was it about? Like all speeches at the rally, about the desire to study and work peacefully, and dreams of a blue sky...

K. Prunskiene, prime minister of the republic of Lithuania, discussed the first steps of the newly formed government and the forthcoming dialogue with Moscow. We are prepared for this dialogue though it will be difficult for us. K. Prunskiene asked those assembled to support the plans of the government of Lithuania.

Participants in the rally were informed right away about the initial results of a survey of rally participants carried out by sociologists from Vilnius State University. According to their data, 98 percent of those gathered approved of the independence of the republic, and 1.5 percent did not approve. Eighty percent viewed the work of the Supreme Council of Lithuania as favorable, 10 percent as satisfactory, and another 10 percent as unsatisfactory.

It was also announced that, as had been calculated in keeping with generally accepted methods, about 300,000 people were taking part in the rally.

Many other people spoke at this rally in Vingis Park. Journalists from Prague reported that a demonstration in support of Lithuanian independence was held in Prague, that they were filming this meeting and would tell the truth about the events in Lithuania to the people of Czechoslovakia.

Duma R. Rozukas, member of the People's Front of Latvia; V. Yuriy, representative of the Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka [Rukh]; Z. Poznyak, representative of the People's Front of Belorussia; G. Fish representing the Jewish Society, and others congratulated the residents of the republic on the restoration of independence.

Participants in the rally commemorated the victims of Tbilisi with a minute of silence.

The rally was drawing to a close. Republic of Lithuania Deputy Prime Minister R. Ozolas proposed sending a protest telegram to USSR Minister of Defense D. Yazov. On behalf of the participants in the 300,000-strong peaceful rally, the telegram protested against the insolent actions of military helicopter pilots and the method of using force and intimidation.

Verses by actor K. Genis were read.

To the sound of the initial chords of the song by V. Mikalauskas and J. Marcinkiavicius, "To Mother-Lithuania," all participants in the meeting held hands, in the Baltic way, and sang this song which is dear to the heart of every Lithuanian.

V. Landsbergis, chairman of the republic of Lithuania Supreme Council, approached the microphone once again. His words addressed to those assembled were:

—Do you know what you want?

A chorus of thousands of people responded:

—Freedom!
—Will you forsake the peaceful road you've taken, will you give up your goal?
—No, no!
—Great difficulties and trials lie ahead. Will we overcome all of this?
—We will overcome, we will overcome!
—Thank you for that!

A resolution addressed to USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev was adopted on behalf of the rally participants.

The anthem of the republic of Lithuania was sung.

The rally ended. Some of its participants were in no hurry to go home while others were leaving. Lithuania is not that big; before the end of the day they could reach both Klaipeda and Skuodas...

The guests of Vilnius from the Ukraine, Henryka and Svyatoslav Pedanyuk, surrounded by their new friends, came to the rally with their five-year-old daughter Oksana.

"What will you remember about this day?"—Oksana was the first to respond to this simple question of mine:

"The planes did not scare me!.."

It is nice when you can smile or laugh over this unexpected answer from the little interlocutor after a short pause...

The head of the family went on to say:

"Seriously, you surprise people. They threaten you and you sing!"

Henryka said: "Indeed, at this rally I understood that you are truly not alone. May the aspirations and hopes of your people come true."

Landsbergis Asks Gorbachev for Restraint

90UN1553C Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 11 Apr 90 p 1

[Letter from V. Landsbergis, chairman of the republic of Lithuania Supreme Council, to USSR President M. Gorbachev]

[Text] USSR, Moscow, Kremlin

Esteemed President,

We are concerned about the extreme right-wing, great-power forces prompting you to take an incorrect step, to carry on the wrongful cause of the 1940's in the Baltic area. In the name of peace, justice, and accord on earth, I ask you not to do this.

[Signed] V. LANDSBERGIS, chairman of the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council

Prunskiene Letter to Gorbachev, Ryzhkov

90UN1551A Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 12 Apr 90 p 1

[Letter from K. Prunskiene, prime minister of the republic of Lithuania: "To USSR President M.S. Gorbachev, USSR Council of Ministers Chairman N.I. Ryzhkov"]

[Text] The republic of Lithuania government proposes to the USSR Government to begin preparations for negotiations and pertinent agreements on the entire set of issues associated with the interests of the USSR and the republic of Lithuania.

We suggest that representatives of the government of Lithuania be received in Moscow for consultations on this issue.

[Signed] K. PRUNSKIENE, prime minister of the republic of Lithuania
10 April 1990

Lithuanian Supreme Council Presidium Chosen

90UN1572A Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 31 Mar 90 p 1

[Decree of Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Republic "On Election of Members of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Republic"]

[Text] The Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Republic decrees:

To elect as members of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Republic the following deputies of the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Republic:

Dgidiyus Bichkauskas, Romas Gudaytis, Mechis Laurinkus, Eugennyus Petrovas, Aloizas Svkalas, Gyadiminas Vagnoryus.

[Signed] V. LANDSBERGIS, chairman of the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Republic
Vilnius, 29 March 1990

Report on 25 Apr Estonian Supreme Soviet Session

LD2604103590 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1700 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Summary] Raul Malk reports on today's Supreme Soviet session. Three new ministers were endorsed: Jaak Tamm will be the minister for industry, Siiri Oviir minister for social security, and Toomas Somera will be the new communications minister.

No agreement was reached in respect of the economic blockade on Lithuania, with two draft resolutions in existence. One, drawn up by Deputy Tiit Made, condemns the blockade, appeals for solidarity with Lithuania, and says that should Lithuania need assistance from Estonia, it will be made available; the other drawn up by the equal rights group and presented by Deputy Sergey Petinov, supports the policy of Moscow. Discussion will continue tomorrow.

A resolution was adopted in respect of the 26 March decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet on partially depoliticizing law and order bodies, with 61 votes in favor [105 deputies total in Supreme Soviet]. The decree as it stands did not receive full support. The resolution adopted says that it is necessary to depoliticize law and order bodies promptly and thoroughly, that the legal commmission of the Supreme Soviet will draw up a draft law on parties by 20 May and that the Presidium will reword the decree and present the altered version to the Supreme Soviet anew.

Estonian Parliament Condemns Lithuanian Sanctions

LD2504185390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1753 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Albert Maloveryan]

[Text] Tallinn, 25 Apr (TASS)—At the session of the Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet that is continuing here, a draft resolution negatively evaluating the economic measures adopted by the USSR Government concerning Lithuania was submitted for examination by deputies.

The Soviet leadership's measures were called "economic aggression" in the text of this document. The "cautious and indifferent attitude of the bearers of democratic ideals—the countries of the EEC and northern Europe," is condemned at the same time, and regret is expressed regarding "the United States' wait-and-see attitude." The authors of the draft are proposing that the legislature state the readiness of the people and government of Estonia to render economic assistance to the people of Lithuania, "as soon as required."

A group of deputies tabled an alternative draft resolution in which the actions of the USSR president and Soviet Government concerning Lithuania are assessed as correct and logically consistent with the situation that has arisen and fully in accord with international norms. The draft says that further escalation of tension, brought about by the unconstructive approach of the Lithuanian leadership, "renders impossible any real dialogue on the so-called Lithuanian question and leads to the need for direct presidential rule."

Examining the draft resolutions, the majority of deputies came to the conclusion that it would be expedient to familiarize themselves more thoroughly with the political and economic assessments contained in the document to be adopted. It was decided to continue the debate at the morning session on 26 April.

Deputies began discussing a decree of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium "on the partial depoliticization of the law-enforcement organs of the Estonian SSR" of 26 March 1990. It provides for the elimination of structural subdivisions of parties, sociopolitical organizations, and public movements in the organs of the court, procuracy, internal affairs, and state security of the Estonian SSR.

Estonia To Continue Supplying Lithuania

LD2604084990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] The Estonian government examined at its meeting the question of supplies to Lithuania. On 19 April Estonia's railways received a message from the USSR Ministry of Communications instructing them not to ship goods to Lithuania. The message was accompanied by an extensive list of goods, raw materials, and products that must not be shipped to Lithuania.

It appears that such instructions were not only issued to Estonia's railwaymen.

The Estonian government has instructed Estonia's railways to continue shipments to Lithuania to fulfill all contracts signed with Estonia's enterprises and trading organizations. If it is not possible to fulfill obligations by rail, motor transport will be used. The republican transport ministry has been instructed accordingly.

Ryuytel, Lippmaa To Meet Yakovlev for Discussions

LD2604094590 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 0900 GMT 26 Apr 90

[Summary] It was revealed during this morning's Supreme Soviet session that tomorrow Arnold Ryuytel, chairman of the Supreme Soviet and Endel Lippmaa, minister responsible for talks with Moscow, will meet Yakovlev, member of the Presidential Council.

Military Conference Sends Message to Gorbachev

LD2604132390 Moscow TASS in English 1314 GMT 26 Apr 90

[Text] Tallinn April 26 TASS—The delegates of the 25th party conference of Estonia's Military Commissariat sent an address to President Mikhail Gorbachev today.

The conference drew representatives of all regional and city commissariats of the republic, and also the staff and political department of the Baltic Military District.

The spring call-up has been imperiled now that the Soviet Constitution and Soviet laws on Estonia's territory are being neglected and Estonia's Supreme Soviet is passing laws against them, head of the Political Department of Estonia's Military Commissariat Colonel Redko said in his report.

The call-up system has been disrupted and activities of military commissariats on Estonia's territory have been blocked.

The party conference delegates, concerned by the state of affairs, passed an address to the president, requesting measures to ensure conditions for the normal functioning of military commissariats in the republic.

RSFSR

Gorbachev Begins Second Day in Sverdlovsk

LD2604081190 Moscow TASS in English 0715 GMT 26 Apr 90

[By TASS special correspondents]

[Text] Sverdlovsk April 26 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev began the second day of his visit to the Urals today with a tour of Sverdlovsk, during which he called in at a trading enterprise and inspected the country's first youth residential neighbourhood.

Gorbachev laid a wreath at a Lenin monument and war [as received] and met labour vetrans and young people nearby.

The president has just begun a meeting with workers at the Urals electrical engineering factory, which recently worked for defence and is now readjusting its production facilities to manufacture medical equipment and domestic electronic appliances.

Gorbachev saw a consumer goods exhibition staged by the factory. Following this, the president will visit the Urals research centre.

In the afternoon Gorbachev will participate in a meeting of regional activists.

Visits Department Store

LD2604090990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0516 GMT 26 Apr 90

[Text] [Presenter] I will remind you that you are listening to the Mayak news and musical panorama, and today is the second of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's stay in Sverdlovsk. Our special correspondent Leonid Lazarevich has just come on line from the Mayak studio. Leonid, can you hear me.

[Lazarevich] Yes.

[Presenter] You are on the air.

[Lazarevich] You know, I should apologize to radio listeners. We have misinformed them somewhat about the president's plans. We said that today, Yan Khutaranskiy evidently promised that he would appear in the young people's district and would possibly start his day by laying flowers, which was planned. But the president does not seek...

[Presenter] There are changes in the program, is that right?

[Lazarevich] Yes, but the president does not look for easy ways. What do you think, what did he start the second day of his trip with?

[Presenter] Well, I would not know where to start.

[Lazarevich] With a visit to a department store. As you can understand, that is a sore point.

[Presenter] Yes, that will be complicated.

[Lazarevich] Heated, but the president went there. Mikhail Sergeyevich was met by very many people. There were very many conversations, naturally about prices and changes. Mikhail Sergeyevich stressed that that no solution will ever be adopted without the people. You know what I liked.

[Presenter] You mean contrary to the will of the people.

[Lazarevich] Yes, contrary to the will of the people. They will consult with them and do what the majority consider should be done. Although it cannot be ruled out that some people will not be content. But it must always be decided as most people want. And there were some very interesting conversations and on all kinds of subjects, and on the Union budget. I have just prepared a short excerpt of the conversation of Mikhail Sergeyevich outside the department store, at the entrance to the department store. Let's listen to it.

[Presenter] Yes, let's listen to it. [passage indistinct]

Visits Urals Research Center

LD2604091790 Moscow TASS in English 0902 GMT 26 Apr 90

[Text] Sverdlovsk April 26 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev visited the metal physics institute at the Urals Research Center, at midday local time today. Laboratories of the institute have made many discoveries of world-wide importance, especially in metal physics and electrical conductivity.

However, scientists noted at meetings with the president that they have not tapped all reserves of Urals science to develop riches of the region fully.

Metallurgy and machine-building, traditional Urals industries, are slowly being retooled and are far from being ecologically pure.

Reportage on Gorbachev Visit to Uralmash Factories

Meets Workers

LD2504124790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1217 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] Sverdlovsk, 25 Apr (TASS)—"Uralmash", the famous factory of factories, has become the first enterprise on the program of the Urals visit by Mikhail Gorbachev, president of the USSR. His meeting began with a conversation with the workers. In these first few minutes, businesslike and controversial questions were heard among the traditional greetings. The meeting with the collective of the country's heavy engineering flagship, planned for some hours, will evidently be extended till late in the evening.

Talks With Workers

LD2504223890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Excerpts] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev arrived in Sverdlovsk today. Our special correspondents Leonid Lazarevich and Yan Khutoryanskiy are on the line:

The president spent practically the whole day at Uralmash. Actually he went there straight from the airport after a short break, and according to our information he is still there. [passage omitted]

Here are one or two fragments from his conversations which we have recorded:

[Begin Recording] [Gorbachev] It is a mighty region. And as for the social sphere, housing, and ecological problems—while I walked here for about 300 meters from the gatehouse—people already told me a lot. And that is why we should not put the question just like that without examining the issue. To say: Let's cancel everything at once and let the prices form themselves; well, then the people will definitely say no. And that is why we are thinking here; but we must see that we should not do it so that...if we go for the change and give the incentives to get the people and the enterprises going, then we should free up the money so that these changes will protect the workers, especially the low-paid workers. And not only them, all the rest of the workers should be looked after. That is why I see that at your enterprise here there is no foolish play, you are not loosening up. I should say right away [words indistinct] not for anything. Production goes down, productivity is down; but at your place—I even had a look—even in this first quarter, the present growth of productivity...

[Unidentified member of the crowd interrupts] It is 13 percent.

[Gorbachev continues] But the salary...

[Same voice from crowd interrupts] The salary has grown by only six percent.

[Gorbachev] That is right, the right proportion, and so it should be. But what proportion should there be? Another one too. But it should be done not by squeezing. The modernization of production should be [words indistinct]. And that is why there are these working conditions; I see reconstruction happening at Uralmash. That means you need to adjust the prices as well, so that people, the enteprises, can earn and decide their wages. [?Solve] the social problems, and freeup the money to move toward modernization. So, here we need to work together a good deal, to get our brains in gear.

I have to say that much work has now been done on a draft of new prices, including for heavy industry. And we want, before doing anything, to give it to all enterprises so that they can find their place and show if there is something incorrect in these new prices, if they are put into a difficult position. In short, for six to eight months or so, we must digest all of this in the country. Even if some people are casting around ideas to the effect that someone from above wants to raise prices all at one go, to use shock therapy, do not believe them. We will do it as I have said. We cannot, after all, [do it] as we promised. If we are to do something and reach a situation where we need to change wholesale prices—and they need to be changed—and other prices, then we will discuss it together. We need to discuss this. Otherwise, you will simply throw us out in a couple of weeks after the prices start going wild here, I know. And we ourselves will have to go. We are not so stupid, after all. Maybe we are even feeling too strongly about it, so that some people even started to profiteer from this. [words indistinct] if the working class will begin to present its ultimatums then on whom can the government depend? It is another matter that the government and, in this case, all the leadership of the country, as well as the central powers—which one way or the other determine the economic, legislative conditions, taxation policy, distribution of the resources—should act in such a way as to allow people the opportunity to show and develop their initiative.

That's why there is a lot to think over, but the most important is that in the Ural region—I see it is a common problem, and one feels it here in the Uralmash, too. I can say openly that at such a turning point, we are reckoning on—evidently we've come up to it—necessary agreement and understanding. Because somebody has got an idea that there is an unsatisfactory situation on the market, and so this thing and that thing will follow and the bosses have decided to do it at our expense. Well, if this is the understanding, then I must say that this is not so.

All the same, we...[changes thought] The change that we have been preparing for several years running and especially from 1987, when we set about tboroughly studying the whole reform. [sentence as heard] We were preparing it. All this is needed for us to be able to solve social and housing issues, including housing, and the rest, to achieve a change so that the living conditions in the country will get better. That's why: not for the sake of the market—what is a market; Why the heck do we need it, if it is just some sort of a market—but through the market, through new independence, through new exchanges and links, through people's new economic initiative to achieve new results in order to improve the life. That's why we need it. And to further the technological progress, because we could be improving today. But what about tomorrow? One can get a rise only with technological progress, because one can't squeeze a lot out of these funds.

I see that you listen to the radio and watch television.

[Voices] Yes. We watch (?television).

[Gorbachev] We are now being given a lot of suggestions, including a lot of correct ones. I would say—and this is the most important thing—over this period, we have on our part tried to get an understanding of where we (?stood). And we—I should evidently now say—have now arrived at such a...[changes thought] so much of the foundations have been laid, as I have just said, since 1987 (?on the) approaches to the economy and to reform [passage indistinct]. Comrades, if anyone says that you just have to give a command or give some order, well that is wrong; all of that is behind us. We have already—as the saying goes—been marking time and particularly as far as technological progress and expenditure of resources are concerned. Nowhere is as much electricity or reosurces expended on a unit of production as in our country. In our country, it is one and a half to two times more than in developed countries. That is, recently, the whole growth which we attained, even with difficulty, has all been at the expense of labor resources, only more and more labor. And well, the Urals is the best illustration of that. Well, just look at the distortions. On the one hand, what a mighty Urals, and on the other what a concentraiton of people engaged in hard work. And in questions of the social sphere, the distortions [words indistinct] productive forces. That is true not only of the Urals. But there are specific features here.

[Passage omitted] ...and ecology and as far as prices are concerned.

[Unidentified speaker] Apples are R4 a kilo here.

[Unidentified speaker] Well, what do you mean four? Eight.

[Gorbachev] It is time to hold discussions with you, to hold discussions. Well, what has happened, that now there is more of everything? And of the trade turnover: if earlier in our country, it grew by 12 billion annually up until 1985-86 and even in 1987; now it is 25 or 35 billion for last year—eh...trade turnover. That is, three annual norms. (?It has grown so quickly), and yet there is nothing. Why? Because we have ruptured the balance between monetary incomes and [words indistinct] (?trade). And because there is such a hullaballoo, nobody now believes in the stability of the market. Everything is being swept away, being snapped up, but it is going on.

[Unidentified speaker] Excuse me, Mikhail Sergeyevich, for interrupting you. Well, about cooperation. As you say, we watch television here. All types of cooperation can be set up there: construction, a new cooperative can be set up in a village. But what kind of cooperation can a seller, a seller of applies in a cooperative who earns R300 be in? In an open-hearth furnace...

[Gorbachev, interrupting] A trader, a trader [words indistinct] got somewhere in the south.

[Unidentified speaker] Yes, in an open-hearth furnace, in an open-hearth furnace steel is made, steel in three shifts. Three hundred rubles—can that be, or not?

[Gorbachev] Recently Nikolay Ivanovich [Ryzhkov], your countryman, presented a proposal to the Supreme Soviet on these changes and amplifications on cooperative, to stimulate what you are saying. There are two things which the cooperative movement needs to get rid of: the speculative character, secondhand-dealers, middlemen. That is in the first place. And in the second place, a great many cooperatives are set up in our country under production enterprises. And what do they do? The leaders, in order to decide some of the questions which they receive there, pump money. But the right has been given to the local bodies, to the organizational soviet, oblast soviet, themselves to open and close them. That is why your deputies, you here with your deputies, when you see outrages, you have to point them out. [words indistinct].

[Unidentified speaker] It is not so simple here as you make out. Well, we elect deputies, and so on and so forth. It is not yet that simple here.

[Gorbachev] If in every constituency, five, six, 10, 20, candidates are put forward...

[Unidentified speaker, interrupting] Well, of course, more worker candidates have to be put forward.

[Gorbachev] Well, that is precisely what I wanted to say to you.

[Unidentified speaker] Where are they all to be found?

[Gorbachev] Why workers? Why workers? I don't know if you have the same problem, too? Where are you workers of Uralmash? Where are you workers? Well, where are you voters? You don't you put forward your own? [passage omitted] (?but the people of the Urals, must help us to live), and we will remember that there is the Urals which is also in need of the attention of the government. [end recording]

And here is another audio piece which we found extraordinarily interesting:

[Begin Gorbachev recording] I see the pont of my visit here in talking to you and checking what we have been hearing, and we are hearing about your concern. But all the same, we need to act more sensibly back there, and you need to work more sensibly here. Otherwise we won't get anywhere. [end recording]

Addresses Crowd

LD2504174890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Speech by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev at a meeting in Sverdlovsk with engineers and other workers of Uralmash on 25 April; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Video shows Gorbachev seated on platform] I think that the work being done in Urals and the responsibility which rests on the shoulders of the working people of the Urals requires that everything happening in this area should always be in the field of vision of the center, the government, the party Central Committee, and the country's leadership. In general, I must say that we do have such an understanding from this perspective.

What concerns us is that the Urals, which has done so much for the country, and which is doing and will do so much for the country, this mighty region is, evidently, currently experiencing more excess stress, distortions and excessive loads in its development—not only in production problems, not only in economic ones, but also in social and human ones. This is already evolving into a certain mood. That is, the situation creates anxiety for us, as we imagine it here, and these few hours of mixing and talking with the Uralmash workers go to show that, in general, the information coming in to us is correct, it is not something that has been spiced up, but is realistic.

People are confirming what we already know, which gives rise to certain anxiety. It emerges, evidently, that as it is, this region, which has done so much, always, as they say, resolving immense state tasks without hesitation—tasks of the whole state both in defense and in the entire economy and might of the country—has found itself in a position where many issues concerning the lives of people here have been moved into the background.

At any rate, one can evidently say that here certain deformations have taken place in the development of the Urals' productive forces. And, on the one hand, a vigorous potential has been created, a potential in the cadres, a scientific potential, which is also capable of tackling great tasks in the future provided we correctly manage everything that is here. On the other hand, there is ecology and social tension because in the development of the social sphere there have been great distortions and lagging behind, above all.

That is why, comrades, I would very much like to hear from you your opinions on this issue, about what snags there are in the normal development of the Urals today—how do you see the resolution of these questions: in what directions and by using what methods of approach—what must the center do and what must you, here, do; what must we do together.

I would ask you to tell us about this, especially because this meeting of ours, and my coming to see you in the oblast coincides with a very important stage in the development of our economic reform. We have gone through the preparatory stage of this reform and have fathomed out the country in which we live. Perhaps we have understood, basically at least, its ailments, together with the achievements which it undoubtedly has. We have tried out new approaches and in the sphere of the economy, new methods of management. One thing was successful, another wasn't and we made do, and here and there we simply miscalculated.

But at any rate this was the period in which in each major matter, especially when it is a matter of a most significant turnaround in the country's history, in the development of our huge economy, our complicated economy—we have gone through this period and now there are amounts of work which we have done, both legal and economic, and we have experience, and we have already acquired some experience. [sentence as heard] We have already started thinking differently and we have already started talking to each other differently. So that the prerequisites of a legal and economic nature and of such a psychological nature already exist. There already is an environment in which one can develop further and raise questions of economic reform in a well-founded radical manner.

Therefore, this converation is important from this point of view, all the more so as I see that there is some concern and it has appeared in the press here as well. The fact is that we are discussing among ourselves and want to then put forward for judgement by you—by the workers, specialists, by scientists and by the whole country—those proposals we need to implement now so as, let us put it bluntly, to bring about changes, sharper and more serious turns.

Lack of understanding and anxiety have arisen here. Everyone has felt, first and foremost, that something should be done about prices and asks how we will live. But in general it is a matter of doing something definite so as to live better, so that conditions are better. Not a market for the sake of a market, technology for the sake of technology, but changes to change the situation for the better, and faster, because it is already obvious that people's expectations are at their limit, at their limit, patience is at its limit.

So from this point of view this trip is very important for me. We have held two Presidential Councils, a joint sitting of both the Presidential Council and the Council of the Federation, and we are intending, somewhere around the 10th, to implement those critical remarks and appraisals that were expressed on those proposals that we discussed, on all the things about which I am speaking. We will again return to this and will then go, as they say, to the people in order to surmise everything collectively. Everyone needs to make this turn together if we understand one another.

I do not think everyone will agree, but what we plan to offer to workers in the country, to our cadres, depends on sharp turns, and this needs to be done in such a way that we go through this painful stage with as few losses as possible. Since we understand both the actual level of life in our country, people's material and social provision, we can picture this all and so we cannot allow the use of simple, sudden, shock-like, shock therapy methods.

We will act as we promised, comrades—that when we come to the conclusion we must take coordinated, major steps in the further development of our economy or on other issues concerning the entire society. We will consult with you, because if we were to act in any other way this would be simply a deception of the people and, I will put it bluntly, such turns are all that is needed, now that we have reached agreement and done everything together.

Further Report on Visit

LD2504183990 Moscow TASS in English 1817 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] Sverdlovsk April 25 TASS—By TASS special correspondent:

President Mikhail Gorbachev arrived today in the city of Sverdlovsk, one of the country's major industrial and scientific centres.

The trip to the Urals is being undertaken a week after a joint session of the Presidential Council and the Council of the Federation discussed ways to direct the country's economy along the path of regulated market development.

The implementation of this programme, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed, is unthinkable without consolidating all forces interested in perestroyka, without broad consultations with work collectives.

The Urals is justly called the country's industrial base and shield. This region is the leader of the country's heavy industry and the land of immense natural riches, made famous by the talents of its masters.

The Soviet president met workers of the Uralmash Integrated Works. The trade mark of the machine-building giant, which employs 50,000 people, is known throughout the Soviet Union and in many other countries. Walking and quarry excavators, consumer goods, drilling installations and continuous casting machines are produced here—their total value exceeded R600 million last year.

At the same time, Uralmash needs a radical technical re-equipment. The principles of cost-accounting, introduced here, are in conflict with the diktat of central departments. As a result, the R136 million profit earned by machine-builders last year proved insufficient to radically update production.

Now is the time, Gorbachev said in his address to the workers, to turn from talks and rallies to actual business, to changes. But this, the president said, must be done together because steering this immense country is a far from simple matter.

The Soviet Union has everything that is needed to accomplish this gigantic task: a powerful production base, adequate scientific potential and educated people.

Meeting the president in the shops, Uralmash workers stressed the urgent need to establish order in production. They discused the causes of the commodity crisis, the excessive buying sprees that have stripped the shops, where neither lipstick nor refrigerators can now be bought.

President Gorbachev shared the workers' anxiety over the accumulated problems. He noted that the country is now passing over to their solution, the structural changes are aimed at involving every enterprise and every man in economic reform. "We got a very heavy legacy, and the times dictated the need for a sharp turn," the president stressed. He said that all questions relating to the radicalisation of economic reform must be thoroughly worked out in the coming six to eight months.

The president denied that the country's government intended to use shock therapy in persuing the new pricing policy, a rumour now circulating in the country. Measures planned by the government, he said, aim to reach a new level of economic renewal through the market, through upgrading the independence of enterprises, through new production links and through individual economic initiative.

Gorbachev noted serious disproportions in the development of the Ural region. Huge investments were made in the heavy industry and defence production was stepped up, but the social sphere developed sluggishly. Ecological problems have piled up.

The essence of the new policy consists in making the Urals "face man". For this, it must be given more economic independence.

After touring Uralmash Gorbachev met workers, engineers, technicians and party activists in the enterprise's administration building.

Russian Federation Prime Minister Aleksandr Vlasov, a member of the Presidential Council Veniamin Yarin and Communist Party Central Committee Secretary Oleg Baklanov accompanied the president.

Visit Reviewed

LD2604054190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 26 Apr 90

[Report by correspondent Yan Khutaryanskiy in Sverdlovsk—live]

[Text] [Announcer] As you know, comrades, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, USSR president, arrived in Sverdlovsk on 25 April. The first day of his stay in the Urals was devoted to familiarizing himself with this city and Sverdlovsk's major industrial enterprises. At the moment we have on the line our special correspondent during this visit and our permanent correspondent in Sverdlovsk Oblast, Yan Khutaryanskiy. Yan, can you hear me?

[Khutaryanskiy] I can hear you splendidly. Good morning.

[Announcer] What can you tell us about the first of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbacahev's stay in Sverdlovsk and about today's program?

[Khutaryanskiy] If you don't object we'll start with today since the most important news is expected. Thus, day two. Now, when I came on the air, in Sverdlovsk main square, that is 1905 Revolution Square, very many people had gathered. Here it is planned, according to the program, that flowers should be laid at the monument to the memory of Vladimir Ilich Lenin. I rang up just before I came on the air. Here there is great excitement; the faces are far from apathetic. People are waiting for the president and want to put questions to him in continuation of yesterday's meetings.

Then the guests from Moscow will start to familiarize themselves with Sverdlovsk's Kirovskiy district. This district takes its biography from the war years, when dozens of the country's enterprises that were evacuated were located in the Urals. Major academic sectoral institutes are concentrated here, as are the presidium of the Urals branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and construction industry enterprises. Here there is the first residential youth complex in the country. There are theaters and educational institutions here.

Well, now you asked how the previous day went. We, that is all of our teams, tried to cover it as fully as possible. We were at all the points where the intinerary ran. Well, naturally the content of that day were the meetings at Uralmash, our main enterprise and the main one of the whole of the Urals and one of the most important enterprises in the country. We say at Uralmash that it is a factory of factories. Thus, my colleagues Igor Zorin and Leonid Lazarevich and I reported that the president visited Uralmash and that the conversation there lasted right up until midnight. The conversation was, it appears to me, an impartial one, a very direct one, and Mikhail Sergeyevich liked that. He said that the people of the Urals were reliable people, people with whom one had to speak frankly. There were meetings at the entrance, there were meetings on the shop floor, in workshops—moreover, where there are very difficult, complicated production processes, although there is modern equipment. The result of these meetings was a conversation about the works' management attended by workers, shop and production leaders, the chief experts and young people. What was the conversation about? The conversation was, naturally, about the situation in the country, economic problems at what I would call its

borderline turning points, and naturally about the way people live an work. Do I still have some time, Pavel?

[Announcer] Yes.

[Khutaranskiy] If there is time, a few words about today's program for the stay of the USSR president in the Urals. That is, at the present moment the guests are awaited at the Urals electrical engineering works, which is undergoing adaptation in a sufficiently complicated manner—it is undergoing conversion—but the collective of this works already had interesting experience in producing consumer goods.

Today Raisa Maksimovna Gorbacheva will visit the Urals town of Alapayevsk and will go to the house where Tchaikovsky lived. She will see the museum reserve of wooden architecture in the settlement of Nizhnyaya Sinachikha. And in Sverdlovsk, sometime in the afternoon, a meeting is proposed with the presidium of the Urals Scientific Center of the Academy of Sciences. There will be a meeting with scientists, familiarization with their problems. There are quite a few problems, too, because, these are problems of ecology, problems of saving resources, and many others. And there will be a meeting with the aktiv of Sverdlovsk Oblast. As we have agreed with you, we shall try to provide details and give sound reports in subsequent news bulletins.

Gorbachev in Sverdlovsk Notes Economic Reform

LD2504210790 Moscow TASS in English 2044 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] Sverdlovsk, The Urals, April 26 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, making a trip to the Urals, on Wednesday met designers, engineers and workers of the Uralmash factory in Sverdlovsk.

"Our meeting and my arrival here coincide in time with a very important stage in the development of our economic reform" Gorbachev said.

"We have completed the preparatory stage of this reform, in which we tried new approaches and new methods of economic management. Not everything has been smooth."

The president admitted there was concern and lack of understanding in society, brought about by government-planned measures to radicalise the economic reform.

He said people were worried about possible price hikes and a possible decline in living standards, and assured the audience that the aim of the planned measures was "to make life better."

Gorbachev said the government will amend its plan for the radicalisation of the economic reform before the 10th of May, taking into account critical remarks and proposals made at two joint sittings of the Presidential Council and the Federal Council. After that, the plan will again be discussed by the two councils and published in the press.

"I don't think everyone will approve the proposed measures, because they provide for sharp turns," Gorbachev said. "But this road should be covered with minimum losses."

The president said the country's leadership "will not use shock therapy to normalise market relations in the economy."

Moscow TV Reports on Gorbachev Sverdlovsk Visit

LD2504174390

[Editorial report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1430 GMT on 25 April in its "Vremya" newscast carries a seven-minute video report by correspondent E. Erkomayshvili on Gorbachev's arrival and walkabout in Sverdlovsk.

Over video of Gorbachev and his wife arriving at Sverdlovsk Airport, descending from the plane to be greeted by officials, Erkomayshvili explains that this is the President's first visit to Sverdlovsk. She describes Sverdlovsk and its problems over video of streetscenes.

Correspondent S. Slipchenko then takes over, describing how Gorbachev was surrounded by workers asking questions at the Uralmash works. The video shows people crowding round Gorbachev outside the works. The report then shows Gorbachev and Raisa being shown round the one of the work's oldest shops, where work conditions are harsh and much of the equipment is poor. Gorbachev is shown talking to workers inside the shop. Back outside, the video shows a man complaining to Gorbachev about the recent elections at the works and Gorbachev responding:

"[First man] I work in shop no. 15. There are just over 1,000 of us. We did have meetings at one point, we did nominate someone, but the head of our shop was nominated not by us in our building, but somewhere else, on our behalf. And we did not put anyone forward.

"[Gorbachev] If you gather in your workshop, you have your triangle or your pentangle there, if the thousand gather and say we are nominating you, or someone else, you perhaps, nobody has anything against that, it is according to the law.

"[Second man] And nobody will cancel it.

"[First man] Democracy has to start first and foremost at the works.

"[Gorbachev] I would just like to say that here we have probably discussed the theme to some extent, whether it should be according to territory or works by works. Then everybody spoke, including democratic circles in Sverdlovsk which spoke very strongly, saying that it should not be according to the characteristics of production, but by territorial boundaries. And I can see what we now have, and we have found it in Russia as well: That there are no real representatives of the working class. Even in the local bodies there are too few from the working class. I

can see that at this turning point, the workers should have known everything, and we should have opted for this. No, listen, we were accused at the time of conservatism, that we were supposed to be on the road of democracy, but what kind of democracy was this, that we wanted to take them by the throat. And, incidentally, some of the most energetic ones were here among you. Further, what we want is that people should again get to the party congress directly from the lower levels, from the primary organizations. We have opted to abolish election from oblast conferences, and we have provided elections directly at primary level. So you can nominate, vote and elect for yourselves."

Slipchenko says that many of the industrial enterprises in the Urals are growing old. This is an acute problem here. The video shows Gorbachev addressing a different group of people outside. Gorbachev says: "The Urals, in the sense of its assets, has grown old. We must think about this. This means that prices also should be regulated to allow people, enterprises to earn, to bring earnings [to the right level—Gorbachev gestures with his hand], so to speak, to resolve social issues, and to free money and accumulate it for modernazation. So, here, we need jointly to work a good deal, to get our brains moving. I have to say that much work has now been done on a draft for new prices, including for heavy industry, and before doing anything we want to give it to all enterprises so that they can find their place and show if there is something incorrect in these new prices, if they put them into a difficult position. In short, for six to eight months or so we must, as it were, digest all this in the country. Even if some people are throwing out ideas to the effect that someone from above wants to raise prices all at one go, to use shock therapy, do not believe them. We will do it as I have said. We cannot, after all, as we promised; if we are to do something and reach a situation where we need to change wholesale prices—and they need to be changed—and other prices, then we will discuss it together. We need to discuss this."

Slipchenko comments that the country is no longer split into people at the top and the bottom. We need to work together to solve the country's problems. The video then shows Gorbachev standing on the doorstep of what appears to be the party commitee building of the Uralmash works. Gorbachev speaks over the rather noisy crowd: "I see the point of my visit here in talking to you and checking what we have been hearing, and we are hearing about your concern. But all the same, we need to act more sensibly back there, and you need to work more sensibly here. Otherwise we won't get anywhere. There is a lot of talk now about what the government has planned with the reforms. You have known for a long time what the government has planned, but now we have reached a stage when we will begin to submit proposals to you, and before setting things going, we will discuss it with you. So don't worry. That's all. Good-bye." Gorbachev waves to the sound of cheers.

Journalist Gives Impressions of Uralmash Visit

LD2504140190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1215 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Excerpts] Today Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev arrived in Sverdlovsk. Our special correspondents are there. Ready to come on the line now is Leonid Lazarevich.

[Lazarevich] I would like to speak about my impressions. My comrades, Zorin and Khutaryanskiy, are now at Uralmash where the president is. I want to say what I have seen and heard myself. The arrival of Mikhail Sergeyevich in Sverdlovsk was bare of any external effects. There was no multitude of persons meeting him, there were no cries of greeting and this somehow stressed the working nature of the trip. At the airport there was a brief exchange of opinion of literally a few sentences with the leaders of the oblast and Mikhail Sergeyevich, I think immediately after this, or perhaps after a very brief rest of perhaps 15 or 20 minutes, left for Uralmash, the enterprise known to all the country. [passage omitted]

Before Mikhail Sergeyevich arrived at the enterprise Igor Zorin, my colleague, talked to (Viktor Petrovich Tolstagan), secretary of the party committee of the enterprise. Listen to the tape:

[Begin recording] [passage omitted] [Tolstagan] To be honest we have been long waiting for the first leader of the country to visit us. At the fifth plenum of the oblast party committee such proposals were heard. In March it was proposed to invite Mikhail Sergeyevich to the oblast conference. He could not accept but today we are glad to meet him although it is slightly unexpected. There are many problems in the Urals but I think Mikhail Sergeyevich wants to check his plans, his ideas, especially in economic policy, check them against such major industrial centers like the Urals. Evidently he may be planning further trips, but we may have a regionalistic approach—we have concentrated practically all the major industry of the country. [end recording]

[Lazarevich] [passage omitted] Workers met him, they asked him difficult, complex questions about the slow progress of perestroyka and the unsatisfactory nature of its progress and about the standard of living of the workers. The converation has so far been on the level of brief exchange, it is hard to speak of an answer so far. [passage omitted] But I would like to stress one sentence of Mikhail Sergeyevich's. He plainly told the workers: I have come here to consult you. Without consulting you we cannot undertake anything. I think this is the pivot of the trip. [passage omitted]

TASS Examines Gorbachev's Ural 'Consultations'

LD2504142190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0858 GMT 25 Apr 90

[By TASS commentator Vladimir Petrunya]

[Text] Moscow, 25 Apr (TASS)—Mikhail Gorbachev is beginning what he has called "wide-scale consultations with labor collectives" on the subject of the transition of the country's economy to a market economy track. Today he arrived in Sverdlovsk, a major industrial center of the Urals, where demands for radical changes have recently been energetically made.

The Soviet leader understands perfectly well how difficult the discussion with workers in the Ural towns will be against a background of bare shelves in the shops, but he particularly needs to know how they would perceive the short-term prospect of new social upsets. Although the idea of a decisive transition to a market economy was called "the greatest turnaround" since the 1917 October Revolution at the session of the Council of the Federation and the Presidential Council of the USSR a week ago, such a starting-point cannot be without pain for society.

Meanwhile, more than 1,000 out of approximately 1,200 types of goods are absent from Soviet shops. The only thing which people have an abundant wealth of is money, with which you cannot buy anything. The Ural workers are unlikely to be prepared to part with this without reservations in exchange for prospects of living better. However, it was they who, at rallies two months ago, demanded the replacement of the party leadership and the transfer of power to democratic soviets.

The history of the Urals is one of highly skilled work and honor. It is possible that therein lies one of the internal motives for Gorbachev's decision to hold informal consultations here on ways of radicalizing the economic reform.

Up until now the Urals have remained unmarked areas on the map of Gorbachev's trips around the country. He has had hundreds of meetings in workshops, on the streets, and in the club halls of towns and villages of the Far East, Siberia, the Kola Peninsula, Leningrad, the Ukraine, Lithuania, Latvia, and the center of Russia. This is the Soviet leader's working style. Because such trips are usually accompanied by public speeches by Gorbachev about his program, in addition to frank dialogues with numerous people, it is to be expected that a key subject in the Urals will be substantiation of the extent to which the concept of a transition to a regulated market economy "is in full accordance with progress toward a humane and democratic socialism."

Yeltsin Assesses RSFSR Congress, Presidency

LD2504102190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0405 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Studio interview with Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, people's deputy of the USSR and of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR), by unidentified presenter—live]

[Text] [Presenter] The time now is exactly 0805, for those hurrying to work, but for those who have the opportunity to listen, we will permit ourselves to ask Boris Nikolayevich three questions.

Well, Boris Nikolayevich, we are all impatiently awaiting the Congress of people's deputies of Russia. As far as everyone knows, you are also taking part in the preparations for it. Please tell us what stage this work so important to us all has reached.

[Yeltsin] The preparations are going ahead sufficiently actively. They are moreover progressing in two directions, as it were. The first is the official organizing committee which has been set up and on which there are representatives from the Democratic Russia bloc. But at the same time the deputies who are members of that bloc are, as it were, preparing their own alternative proposals for discussion at this Congress of People's Deputies of Russia. According to the preliminary proposals made by the apparatus of the Supreme Soviet it was proposed that only organizational issues would be examined there. But it is our opinion that should not be done under any circumstances, that we should disappoint our Russian electorate. Therefore, at the first congress one must discuss absolutely businesslike issues related to the life of our voters.

[Presenter] Boris Nikolayevich, we invited you first and foremost because one very important question is of interest to us. Well, yesterday it was announced that a president has been elected in Kazakhstan. There they have taken the path of setting up presidential power just as in the country as a whole. So, what is your attitude and, evidently, that of the Democratic Russian bloc to this issue? Does Russia need a president, and if it is necessary, then why?

[Yeltsin] I see. I believe that presidential power in Russia, where 140 million people live, after all, is needed, but a president should not be elected immediately at the present at the First Congress of People's Deputies of Russia. I was against a hasty solution to this question when the country's president was being elected at the Third Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR.

At present, I also believe that over the course of a year, say, a whole block of laws should be drawn up and adopted which are connected with the presidency. This would deal with the state system of the Russian federation, with the relations between the autonomous regions, so to speak, and the center, all that is connected with the president, with restricting his power, increasing the level of legislative power so that the president does not, as it were, exceed this power, and a number of other things. Only after these laws have been adopted,—let's say, in a year—should nationwide direct elections in the Russian federation be announced for the country's president [as heard] on a multi-candidate basis, from candidates who will be determined at the Congress of People's Deputies of Russia.

[Presenter] Boris Nikolayevich, popular rumor has it that you may be among the candidates for the post of chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Russia. That's what

people say, anyway; I don't know whether that is so or not. But if it is, what other candidates are there?

[Yeltsin] Yes, in actual fact, when they nominated me and also during meetings with the electorate, I was given, as the voters called it, a political mandate, not to repeat my action at the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies, that is, if I were nominated as a candidate, I should under no circumstances withdraw. I gave the electorate that promise. Therefore, I am preparing for it. For the moment the chances are less than half, but everything will probably depend on the work with the deputies in the pre-congress period. It will probably depend to a certain extent on the programs, and on other factors, let's say, on who will be nominated, inter alia, by the country's leadership.

[Presenter] Can you outline the main points, at least, of your program, just three or four thesis points?

[Yeltsin] It is naturally very difficult to give them very briefly. But the first is, nevertheless, the spiritual, national and economic renaissance of Russia, which for many decades has been an appendage of the center and in many respects has lost its independence. That is, the sovereignty, independence of a Russia which in concluding treaties with all or with each of the 14 other union republics, as well as being a party to a union treaty, would have pretty well, I would say, the maximum status in its autonomy and independence from the center. It would itself hand over to the center a share of power, not the other way round, whereby that share derives from the center. That's one thing.

Further, economic issues—that is a whole program, social issues, the priority of public education, culture and science, precisely as a priority, since in this respect Russia has maybe suffered most of all. It is precisely here that a revival is most needed. Further, there is the issue of cadres, social policy issues, issues of international relations. Russia should have direct ties with many states (?and countries). It should have treaties. The center alone should not have a monopoly of them; the Union should not have them alone. There are a number of other things, too.

[Presenter] Well, thank you. Your time is limited. Incidentally, I promised it would be three questions and it turns out that there are four. How will today go for you? I know that you were already at the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcating at 0700 today. How will your day be made up today, so that people can get an idea of what a people's deputy does?

[Yeltsin] All day today there will be a session of the Supreme Soviet, a joint session of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities. Today the consequences of the Chernobyl tragedy are being discussed.

[Presenter] Which affected Russia, incidentally.

[Yelstin] Which affected Russia both with respect to its territory and the people afflicted, and those who worked there on eliminating, so to speak, the accident and who also suffered. Many issues have not yet been resolved regarding them.

After the session the whole evening is spoken for, with committee work, meetings with various people, includig deputies of the Russian federation. Today, let's say, meetings are envisaged with deputies, executives from the Russian federation and from the Ministry of Internal Affairs, not from the ministry itself but in those territorial subdepartments which are part of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs.

[Presenter] Well, we value your time. It remains only for us to wish you jolly good luck, if you'll forgive the folksy expression, and in your person to wish all the people's deputies of the USSR and RSFSR and of people's soviets good luck in their very important affairs, so necessary for us all.

[Yeltsin] Well, I shall not give my usual reply; I'll say thank you.

Western Republics

Ukrainian Nationalist Discusses Independence

PM2504151290 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 24 Apr 90 p 13

[Interview with Ivan Drach, chairman of the People's Movement of the Ukraine, by Ezio Mauro in Kiev—date not given]

[Excerpt] Kiev—[passage omitted]

[Mauro] Why has Ukrainian nationalism exploded now?

[Drach] Because what is happening throughout the Soviet empire is happening here: The prison is collapsing. Lenin described Czarist Russia as a people's prison, as if 1917 had opened a new chapter. But Stalin simply turned the whole country into a prison camp. Today the doors and gates of that prison camp are breaking open: And you Westerners cannot understand, you see people walking around freely, returning home, and you wonder why this nationalist euphoria is breaking out because it does not seem to be reasonable. But when an animal is trapped for too long, it tries to escape from the trap at any cost, even if it loses a paw in doing so. I am therefore not in the least surprised at what the West calls the obstinacy of the Lithuanians. They now feel that the time has come and they will gain their freedom even if it brings ruin on them. This will be true of us too when our time comes.

[Mauro] Who decides when the time comes for the Ukraine—will it be you as leader of the Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka [Rukh]?

[Drach] Listen, in a way I am a mirror for my people, I am a son of a Soviet generation which has not forgotten its national roots and which has returned to them in the end. I am not ashamed of saying that I was a good

pioneer, an excellent Communist Youth League comrade, a convinced communist. When I joined the party, I was the happiest man in the world. But then I saw that the communist within me was mounting guard on the Ukrainian national idea which I, as a poet, was feeding. Disillusionment with the party grew, and faith in my country increased. I eventually chose, and automatically found myself on the people's side. That is why there are various different groups together in Rukh and we are awaiting our time together. We are united by one enemy—it is the system or the empire, call it what you wish. But it is the power against which we are struggling.

[Mauro] Elsewhere, the national revival is based on anti-Russian feeling, but here in the Ukraine it seems to be anti-Soviet. Is that true?

[Drach] Precisely. There is absolutely no anti-Russian feeling in me. For instance, we can only win if democracy wins in Russia.

[Mauro] In what way?

[Drach] I see and support Landsbergis' battle. I think it is important that the nationalists should succeed in Lithuania and Estonia, but I know that for we Ukrainians, nothing will change in practice. To make us independent, it is vital to have full democratization in Moscow and Russia. In this connection, we welcome the radicals' victory in the Moscow and Leningrad elections, we support Yeltsin's candidacy for president of Russia, we have invited Afanasyev to Kiev to draw up a common strategy. Only a victory for the democrats and radicals in Moscow can bring the prospect of peaceful independence for the Ukraine.

[Mauro] Is that not an openly post-Gorbachev prospect?

[Drach] We say that we identify with the ideas of two great Russians like Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn. Yes, Solzhenitsyn. I know that you regard him as the reference point for the all-Russian, imperial, and nostalgic groups. But he wrote that Russia should give way and allow the Ukraine to choose its own destiny, even if it meant it choosing separatism: If we do not give in, he explained it will be a crazy and cruel act, whereas if we are tolerant, a new unity will be possible in future. I fully share that extraordinary prophecy.

[Mauro] But is the Ukrainian revival not more the result of Gorbachev's perestroyka than of Solzhenitsyn's prophecy?

[Drach] It is important not to forget that even before Gorbachev there were Ukrainian nationalists, they were regarded as dissidents, and as such they ended up in prison. Under Stalin and Brezhnev, at least half of the political prisoners were Ukrainian. You Westerners now talk of the Ukrainian revival: We know that our country has always been the empire's main enemy.

[Mauro] Yes, but there is a difference between an era which imprisons nationalists and an era which sees them becoming deputies and chairmen of the Soviets: Is it just an accident that this is all happening in the years of perestroyka?

[Drach] There is no doubt that Gorbachev has great merits. My judgment of that man, however, is still complex. On the one hand, I thank him daily for having launched perestroyka. On the other hand, I criticize him for not wanting to allow the republics to leave the Soviet prison. He would like to turn this USSR prison camp into a comfortable palace, but it is impossible. I think he should allow each state which wants to leave the USSR to do so. Then, whoever decides to return will be able to do so. But they will do so on the basis of freedom, not in chains.

[Mauro] Is it realistic to think that the USSR could agree to lose the Ukraine?

[Drach] It is not realistic in 1990. But take care: Our time will come soon, it is inevitable. And it may be very soon, if Russia finally becomes free. If it realizes that it is paying too high a price for Soviet imperialism and thinks of the thousands and thousands of empty houses in its deserted villages, with the windows barred. If Russia starts to think about its soul. But you cannot understand.

[Mauro] Why are you so convinced that the West is deaf and blind?

[Drach] Because the West is egotistical, it is afraid that the nationalist movements will destabilize perestroyka and reawaken the USSR as an enemy, they see Gorbachev as the great stabilizer. If he is so dear to your hearts, why not take him to lead your country? It is a very serious matter that the West is sacrificing our peoples' rebirth to one man's reputation.

[Mauro] Are you warning the West that here in Russia, where everything began, everything will end?

[Drach] No, nothing ends permanently. For instance, the problem of the unification of the Ukraine with Russia and Belorussia may reappear tomorrow, in another way, and in various forms. And this future unification may fulfill our history because the USSR interrupted the history of Russia, it did not complete it. History does not die and it can start again, but first these chains our ours must fall.

Ukranian Rukh Leader Argues for Sovereignty

90UN1464A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 15, 11 Apr 90 p 3

[Statement by Ivan Drach, Rukh leader and writer, Kiev: "No, We Are Not Little Russians!"; published under the rubric "Up to Secession?...Straight Answers to Straight Questions"]

[Excerpts] Perhaps not only our parliament, which is working on a package of relevant legislative acts, is preoccupied with the thoughts of the future model of our union and of a new federation these days. This is our

common concern. Therefore, many writers have plunged into the vortex of political discussions, having postponed their work on new pieces until better days. The range of opinions on this is extremely wide: on the one hand, the inviolability of "the great and mighty Soviet Union," and, on the other, "up to secession." We have approached a number of writers with a suggestion to make a statement in the pages of our newspaper on how they imagine the future of their republics. Today, Kazakh Anuar Alimzhanov and Ukrainian Ivan Drach have a say. We hope that the readers will judge for themselves which of the statements they may agree with and which they may take issue with having read the answers to the questions offered by the editorial office. In any event, we need to share our opinions and know each other better if we are to foretell the future.

Therefore:

1. How do you imagine a new Union treaty, a new federation? What common national idea will the independence [samostoyaniye] of your republic be based on?

2. Which illusions should be avoided at present in the process of national awakening? What would you like to caution your people against along this path?

3. Will your people preserve their character and their spiritual culture if the republic secedes from the USSR? Is there a danger that it will end up as a provincial neighbor of more powerful states?
[Signed] The LITERATURNAYA GAZETA Department of Literatures of the Peoples of the USSR

[passage omitted on statement by Anuar Alimzhanov]

1. A genuine Union is possible when all the republics which want to secede leave the Union. Therefore, first comes secession, sovereignty, separation, which does not happen without ethnic euphoria, and only later a free Union of free peoples and free republics. Lenin called Russia a prison of the peoples, and Stalin upgraded it to the most horrible condition of a concentration camp. How can this prison be remodeled, on the basis of what new Union treaty?! All the discipline of logic and all the paradoxes of illogical statements suggest the only conclusion—seceding from the Soviet Union. The duty of Russia is to secede first and help others. A free Ukraine is impossible without a free Russia. A common European house of the peoples is impossible without the Ukraine; after all, it is in our republic, in Transcarpathia, that the geographical center of Europe is. The more active the centripetal forces are going to be at present the more vigorously the centrifugal force, maybe even a tragic one, will tear the peoples away from the center. Will those at the helm of power have enough intelligence and conscience to feel the entire depth of modern currents?! After all, the barbed wire of the border does not separate the Ukraine from Poland, Czechoslovakia, or Romania. Will the new politicians realize that no Berlin wall will separate the Ukraine and Russia? The Baltic area may, if it so wishes, go out to the Baltic Sea—the Scandinavians are nearby whereas the Christian Ukraine may go across the Black Sea only to be embraced by Muslim Turkey.

2. That we are not the best in the world, and not the worst, that we are just the most ordinary and the most extraordinary people with a tragic history (Stalin exterminated a greater number of Ukrainian peasants than the Baltic area has population at present; the Ukrainians gave up their native tongue by the million; there is not a single Ukrainian school in Donetsk where there are no fewer Ukrainians than in Canada, and there is not a single Ukrainian school in the fraternal RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] either in Kuban or in the "Green Wedge" of the Far East. Ukrainophobia was present in the prison atmosphere; an embroidered shirt was called "an anti-Semitic shirt," a Muscovite was contrasted with the khokhol [derogatory name for Ukrainians] as the plus with the minus, the Ukrainian prostrated himself and adapted, and was glorified only as a representative of the imperial estate; a "Little Russian" became such a "Great Russian" that he could teach any representative from Ryazan or Rostov a thing or two about general Russian patriotism. This is why the average consciousness of the Ukrainian easily sees an outside enemy; it is difficult for that same Ukrainian to see his main adversary, quite frequently a very sly and insidious one at that, in the mirror.

In our land, conditions should be created for the peoples—Ukrainians and Jews, Russians and Poles—to perceive the Ukraine as their motherland and be free. The word "sovereignty" is the most popular word; however, it only helps solve the general problems of human existence; it is not at all a cure-all for every misfortune. This word is not a magic wand or a golden key to open all locks. However, sovereignty attracts as a magnet. This is not the attraction of butterflies to a deadly fire but rather a turn of young sunflowers to the warm breath of the sun.

3. The nucleus of an atom was split in Kharkov for the first time, and the first encyclopedia of cybernetics was published in the Ukrainian language. Vernadskiy is an integral part of Ukrainian science, and it is not necessary for Bortnyanskiy and Vedel to be called Russian composers—they were Ukrainians. Recently, a group of Russian tourists—they say from Tambov—visited the Kiev Sofiya Cathedral, and listened to the narration of the guide: The center of ancient Russian culture. Ancient Russian Prince Yaroslav the Wise was tied by the bonds of kinship to all the royal houses of Europe. Kiev is the mother of all the cities of Russia—and other similar high-school pronouncements. One female tourist, surprised and outraged, gave the capital of the Ukraine a severe look and asked in bewilderment: "When did the Ukrainians take all of it from us?"

We did not take anything from anyone... They are going to erect a monument to the Millennium of Baptism in Moscow, a city which was not on the map in the time of Prince Vladimir the Baptist. The very name Rus, torn from the heart of Kiev by the iron fist of Peter, was

asserted across his entire empire. Likewise, we did not take the heavy headpiece of Monomakh from anyone; instead, it was taken from us, along with very many other things, to many Hermitages [museums]. This is why there is historic sovereignty among other kinds of sovereignty. Our people are strong enough to shake off the hand of the empire. The Russian people, the Great Russians themselves, should be interested in this first of all. I repeat that a free Ukraine is impossible without a free Russia and a free Belorussia. Rukh has stated repeatedly that it subscribes to this position: The Russians in the Ukraine should live better than they live in Moscow, Leningrad, and New York. The Jews in the Ukraine should feel better than in Moscow, Leningrad, New York, Tel Aviv, and Jerusalem. In this case, it is permissible for the Ukrainians in the Ukraine to strive for a system under which they could live better than the Ukrainians live in the United States and Canada. Such is the "nationalism" of Rukh. Thousands of Ukrainian intellectuals on the American continent in many colleges of the new world are living proof of the viability and endurance of our people. Having gotten rid of the "Little Russian" complex, we will live in the world community as people among people.

One icon from the vicinity of Kiev ended up in the north and became the Vladimir Madonna, another ended up in the West and became Matka Boska Czestochowska [published in Polish—the Black Madonna of Czestochowa]. We are left in the care of Maty Bozha Chornobylska [published in Ukrainian—the Madonna of Chernobyl]. In her care we remain...

Ivashko Concluding Remarks at Party Plenum

90UN1321B Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 28 Feb 90 p 3

[V.A. Ivashko concluding remarks at February 1990 Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenum]

[Text] Comrades! We need to sum up our discussion. The main conclusion which we must draw is that our society, the people of the Ukraine included, has no other path than perestroyka. Everything else is a return to the impasse from which we have begun to emerge and a push toward the abyss of acute social situations, which our people simply would not endure. For this reason there is one path—the persevering labor of all communists and the whole Ukrainian people for the building of a society which our people, our multinational Ukraine, deserve.

Many steps forward have already been taken on this path of renewal. A fundamentally new situation has taken shape in society. Active debate has started, and specific measures to ensure the republic's political and economic sovereignty are already being adopted. A serious struggle to emerge from the ecological crisis is being conducted. Important steps are being taken for a revival of Ukrainian culture and the native language and the free development of the culture and languages of people of other nationalities living on the territory of the republic. Have we ever had this before?

An issue of the newspaper IZVESTIYA recently carried simultaneously three items on the Ukraine. The first was "The Ukrainian Economy Is Changing Course." It described the structural changes in our national economy. Whereas there has for decades been a growth in the relative significance of heavy industry in our republic and a corresponding decline—in terms of both rate and volume—in the manufacture of consumer commodities, it is now the other way around. And such a change is being made for the first time.

The second article dealt with the joint-stock company in the Lvov "Konveyer" Association. And we already have many enterprises and collective farms where the new economic relations have really started to work. Leonid Danilovich Kuchma has said today that a law on conversion should be enacted and that a program thereof should be drawn up. I fully agree. But there are plants—the Pavlograd Chemical and Dnepropetrovsk Mechanical Engineering—in that same Dnepropetrovsk Oblast at which the losses on account of the reduction in the manufacture of defense products are being covered by the production of goods of which the public is in dire need.

And just look at the recent meetings of the republic Supreme Soviet! They have shown that it is by no means a question of the times in which deputies were elected. People have been tackling most important issues freely, in profound debate and in a keen confrontation of opinions. We have already seen a totally different Supreme Soviet.

People are now demanding a more precise position in respect of the place and role of the Ukrainian Communist Party in the political life of the republic and the all-Union party system. And it can be seen from this that the party organization and the entire republic have begun to live with new ideas. And this testifies that we will have a strong party also. On the CPSU Platform, undoubtedly, but with our own program, our own areas of work, our own approaches and our own tactics of action.

Is all this, comrades, not improvement, change? They are under way. But together with this there are phenomena which have rightly caused great concern among many of those who have spoken today at the plenum. Concern in connection with the instability in society and the disquiet among the people. And, in fact, both our law enforcement authorities and our laws must be activated here. Everyone here must have a clear line and precise position. But the first thing that is essential now is the active work of each communist and each primary party

organization and committee up to and including the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and the CPSU Central Committee.

What is needed is not the confrontation but consolidation of society. And, as Comrade M.K. Rodionov rightly said, there is no other consolidating force currently than our party. Strength and stability may be secured only by consolidation. And people only reckon with the strong and stable. This is the conclusion which we must carry to our party organizations.

Very sharp criticism has been heard at the plenum of the politburo, the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, and the republic government. The criticism is just and needs to be made. Although it has to be considered that we are all making the crossing for the first time, so to speak. Of course, it is better to learn from the mistakes of others than from one's own. But we are all making the crossing for the first time. Therefore let us act together.

Only I cannot agree with the words to the effect that the "street" is apparently removing the bureaus and first secretaries of the party committees. It is a question of something else—the inconsistency of action and absence of clear-cut positions among the communists and primary authorities locally.

But there are, comrades, instances of there being no one to defend. We must self-critically assume the blame ourselves for having failed to resolve personnel issues opportunely.

Although I now also believe, and we should record this in a decision, that none other than the legitimately elected soviet authorities and none other than the communists at their meetings, plenums, and conferences may decide any questions in respect of this official or the other.

I believe that we will have very soon to meet yet again to tackle a number of issues. I am talking about the date of the reports and the procedure of the election of congress delegates and members of the party committees. We need all of us here, comrades, to confer locally and to weigh everything up. In my opinion, we need to grant the oblast, city, and rayon party committees a certain freedom on these issues. I will say frankly that I was of the same opinion as expressed here by many comrades in respect of holding the reports and elections after the 28th CPSU Congress. But then, seeing how events are developing and having analyzed our calendar for the year, I hesitated, proceeding from very simple things. After all, we will still have prior to the congress to conduct quite a large-scale election campaign—delegates need to be elected, after all. Consequently, the result will be thus: we elect delegates, the congresses are held and—a report and election campaign once again.... Elections to the soviets, the election of delegates, a report and election campaign in the party once again. Is this not too much? When would any work get done?

It would, of course, be very difficult persuading people now. We should for this reason, possibly, afford the party organizations themselves an opportunity to decide what is most convenient for them (and we will, if you agree, put this question thus). Although, it seems to me, we need to approach the congresses with new party personnel. Otherwise we will be holding congresses with some cadres, but after the congress, electing others. This also is none too logical.

In a word, there is no need to rush now and decide this question conclusively. Let us confer once again. There will be a CPSU Central Committee plenum sometime in the near future for the draft new party rules and one or several options of the procedure of the election of congress delegates and the holding of the report and election campaign need to be presented for discussion. And we also will certainly have to meet one more time because it is necessary to discuss our platform as well. We will then, evidently, finally decide what to do. And we will pass on the opinions which have been expressed here in respect of the drafts of the party platform and rules and the procedure of the holding of the report and election campaign to the CPSU Central Committee.

Comrades! We must emphasize once again that the Ukrainian Communist Party upholds in its policy the interests of the Ukraine, the stability of its development, justice, and equal rights for all who live here. We support accelerated economic development, discipline, organization, and strict compliance with the law. This, I believe, is what the people in our republic expect.

Ukrainian Plenum Sociopolitical Decision Reported

90UN1299B Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 24 Feb 90 p 1

[Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenum decision: "The Present Moment"]

[Text] 1. The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenum believes that the social and political situation in the country and the republic has become critically tense. The situation is being made worse by inconsistency in realization of the economic reform, mismanagement, shortages, and inflation. Social differentiation is intensifying, disregard for the law is growing, morality and law and order are on the decline, and profiteering and crime are spreading.

Forces which, lacking a specific socioeconomic program, are conducting a direct and open attack on the party and socialism, are showing themselves increasingly assertively. They are organizing pressure on the party committees and local soviet ispolkoms [executive committees] and endeavoring by unlawful means to distance the legitimately elected authorities from performance of the functions entrusted to them.

Under these conditions party committees and organizations are displaying confusion and an inability to respond promptly and flexibly to changes in the political

situation, and are attempting to tackle new tasks by the old methods. A gap has emerged between the center and the local authorities and between the party committees and the communist rank and file. The danger is arising of the party's unity being undermined and its structures destroyed.

It is today a question of the fate of the party and socialism, and the future of the USSR and our republic.

The plenum emphasizes that the Ukrainian Communist Party is today the sole political force capable of securing the citizens' nationwide and national interests and of changing the situation in the republic for the better.

2. To instruct the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo and the party committees to adopt decisive measures to stabilize the situation. To closely combine all this work with discussion of the draft platform of the CPSU Central Committee for the 28th Party Congress, using it primarily for the consolidation of the communists and the whole people.

To prepare this March the draft Central Committee platform for the 28th Ukrainian Communist Party Congress, proceeding from the fact that this should be the program document of the Communist Party of a sovereign Ukraine within a renewed Soviet Federation. To submit the draft for discussion by the primary party organizations and to publish it in the press.

The plenum is emphatically opposed to the attempts to disrupt the process of perestroyka in the party committees and organizations by way of the spurring of mass meeting chaos and other forms of power pressure. The Central Committee Commission for Organizational-Party and Cadre Work is to prepare proposals on the procedure of the election of delegates to rayon, city, and oblast conferences, and to congresses of the CPSU and the Ukrainian Communist Party on the basis of direct, secret, and multiple-choice elections.

3. The plenum considers the most urgent task to be the realization of special measures pertaining to economic recovery and instructs the communists in the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet and the republic government to accelerate the formulation and enactment of a law on the economic sovereignty and self-administration of the Ukrainian SSR. To publish proposals for the draft law in the republic press not later than this April. To provide for the reliable protection of the republic economy in relations with the other union republics and the central authorities, and resolutely counter departmental arbitrary action.

In economic and social policy to give priority to the solution of the food problem and the implementation of comprehensive measures pertaining to protection of the interests of the peasantry.

Evaluating the ecological situation in the republic as intolerable and sharing the concern of the public at large in this connection, the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenum supports the measures approved by the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet geared to a fundamental improvement in environmental protection, the preservation of people's health, and the solicitous use of natural resources.

The plenum supports the need for an acceleration of work on elimination of the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl AES [Nuclear Electric Power Station] and the movement in 1990 of people away from the areas where the radiation level is a threat to their health. In this connection the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee demands of the communists working in the republic Council of Ministers and the State Planning Committee decisive action to protect the interests of the population which has suffered from the accident. The plenum deems it extremely necessary that the union government draw up and approve an appropriate state comprehensive program and also a program of operations pertaining to the withdrawal of the Chernobyl AES from operation.

The plenum views as irresponsible the demands of extremist groups concerning the removal of the party organizations from enterprises of industry, construction, and transport, the kolkhozes and sovkhozes [collective and state farms] and the outfits of other spheres, advocating the active enlistment of communists in the development of the economy and the accomplishment of production assignments. The plenum advocates that the primary party organizations be accorded extensive rights and their direct participation in the shaping of the policy of the party and its personnel corps.

The plenum calls on the party organizations and the communists to step up their efforts at the final stage of the election campaign and to support the candidates who take perestroyka to heart and offer realistic and constructive programs.

Noting with concern that the organs of state power in the center and locally are not making full use of their constitutional authority, the plenum appeals to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet to ensure unswerving compliance with current laws and speed up the enactment of new ones which reliably guarantee stability and order and protect citizens' life, honor, and dignity.

The plenum makes it incumbent upon the party committees and organizations to conduct a constructive dialogue with all public forces adhering to the positions of a socialist choice and to actively counter the attempts by extremists to manipulate public opinion and spur tension by way of the spread of every conceivable rumor, invention, and insinuation. It is the duty of communists to show the true colors and aims of the organizers of provocative actions and emphatically rebuff their attempts to penetrate the youth milieu and take advantage of the absence there of sufficient experience of life and politics.

4. The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo and the obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms [oblast, city, and rayon party committees] to extensively inform the working people through the press, television, and radio of the development of the situation in the republic and the country and the progress of the accomplishment of political, economic, and social tasks, and to explain the positions of the party committees on the issues disturbing people. To adopt measures for a solution of the most acute problems in the field of journalism.

It is essential that the communists working in the mass media and all journalists recognize in depth their personal responsibility for the possible consequence of ill-conceived, politically unconsidered speeches, which could lead to an explosion of negative emotions and outright violence. That the party committees actively resist the aspirations of individual groups to use the mass media for their own egotistical, ambitious ends, and oppose the blackening of journalists adhering to party, socialist, internationalist positions.

5. The plenum emphasizes that particular importance today is attached to the ideological and organizational strengthening of the party ranks, the communists' unity of action, the comradeship of the party, and the strengthening of its ties to the people.

It is necessary to dissociate from those who have in practice placed themselves outside of the party and who do not share its program goals. To deem it expedient in the process of preparation for the 28th CPSU Congress for the primary party organizations to make an evaluation of the ideological and political positions of each party member.

The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenum emphasizes that the social and political atmosphere may be changed for the better not by talk, mass meetings, or picketing but only by persevering, disciplined labor, the consistent solution of urgent questions, and the conscious performance of one's civic duties.

The participants in the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenum address the CPSU Central Committee and the Central Committee Politburo in order to express the concern of the republic's communists and working people at the dangerous development of the social and political situation in the country and the abrupt stimulation of destructive forces endeavoring to frustrate the process of perestroyka, thirsting for power and calling for civil disobedience.

We express confidence that the party committees and organizations, communists, and all working people of the Ukraine, rallied around the CPSU Platform, will display an understanding of the crucial nature of the present moment and a high degree of organization, and will resolutely rebuff the anti-perestroyka forces and do everything to overcome the difficulties and ensure the dynamic development of the economic and social sphere of the republic and the spiritual regeneration of our people.

Moldavian Party First Secretary Interviewed

90US0838A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 16, 21-27 Apr 90 p 2

[Interview with P. Luchinskiy, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, conducted by correspondent D. Makarov; date and place not given: "Changes Have To Ripen"]

[Text] [Makarov] Now, when the USSR Supreme Soviet has elected a president of the USSR, do you consider it necessary to establish an analogous office in Moldavia?

[Luchinskiy] This question will be decided by the republic's newly elected Supreme Soviet. It seems to me personally that the establishment of an office of president in our republic, now, at least, would be premature. It was, after all, only recently that we made the changes to the Constitution concerning the Supreme Soviet and its chairman and have yet to apply them in practice.

[Makarov] Is not the structure which has evolved in our country, whereby real power still belongs to the hierarchy of party committees, an impediment in the way of radical transformations?

[Luchinskiy] You are probably right, and I believe that many communists, including those working in these committees themselves, understand that the times of the monopoly possession of power are coming to an end. However, I am convinced that a multiparty system cannot be imposed by decree either. Time is needed for new political parties to grow and for the necessary experience to be acquired, and for the people to get to know them. Continuity is needed more than ever here, otherwise we will not avoid serious upheavals.

For my part, I am prepared to cooperate with all constructive movements of Moldavia and to support them.

[Makarov] But many "informal" politicians regard you skeptically merely on account of your biography. You are for them the personification of the party apparatus.

[Luchinskiy] Formally, they are right. Indeed, my whole career, virtually, has been spent at the heart thereof, so to speak. I joined the Komsomol [Communist Youth League] and the party in Khrushchev's time, but thousands of other people joined the Komsomol and the party at the same time as I, and doubting their honesty and decency would be unjust. We all had one failing: We were from birth "installed" in a one-party political system, and identical "ideals" were instilled in all of us. Nonetheless, even under this system active people, seeking changes, joined the party apparatus. Just analyze it, and you will see that it has been people of that generation who have joined boldly in the restructuring processes.

I believe that man is defined not only by the past, but also by his capacity for inserting a period after it, if it merits one, and beginning life anew, and if he is a leader, helping others to do this also.

It is not his position in the party and state hierarchy and not even his education (at least, not only these) which determine a leader's potential and his capacity for changing under the impact of changes and himself implementing them.

[Makarov] Very well, how then do you interpret the changes in Lithuania?

[Luchinskiy] I have to say that we in Moldavia have been following most closely the development of events in this republic and the reaction to them in Moscow.

Of course, I agree with A. Brazauskas when he says that the declaration of Lithuania's independence should have been the Lithuanian Government's last step, not its first, as was in fact the case. This situation is understandably highly complex.

But it is now necessary to proceed from today's actual state of affairs, when one party has demanded an immediate "divorce." The aspiration to self-sufficiency and independence, whether of an individual or a people, is hard to contest if there is scrupulous adherence to the Charter of Human Rights. And I see no solution other than at the negotiating table. And the fact that these negotiations are being delayed is creating tension in other republics, in Moldavia included, where there is no less complex a national situation. Lithuania is the touchstone on which the capacity of the central authorities for solving such questions under the conditions of our multinational country in accordance with mutual consent is being tested.

[Makarov] You say that the national problem is serious in your republic. As far as I know, this concerns primarily relations between Moldavians and the Russian-speaking population. What, in your view, are the ways of resolving it?

I proceed primarily from the fact that in the past the peoples currently inhabiting Moldavia lived together in peace for centuries and that we will have to live together in the future, whether we like it or not. Consequently, it is essential on all contentious issues to look for compromise. And compromise means mutual concessions and an ability to step into the other's shoes and understand him. The principal topic of discussion in Moldavia currently is the language question.

Moldavian has in recent decades been on the verge of extinction, virtually. In the villages even you will not meet people speaking pure Moldavian. No one in Moldavia questions the need to know Russian as the language of interethnic communication, but please tell me what to do to ensure that the Russian-speaking population takes a step toward those together with whom it lives and starts to study their language. This would not only demonstrate our respect for one another, but would also create favorable conditions for the solution of the republic's common problems. We are for the equal development of the culture and languages of all the peoples inhabiting Moldavia.

[Makarov] Nonetheless, there are particular features to the nationality problem in Moldavia also. I refer to the ethnic linguistic and cultural proximity to Romania, which is giving rise to a trend toward unification. Is this not so?

[Luchinskiy] Yes, there is such a trend, and it intensified following the ouster of Ceausescu. I cannot say that it has acquired great popularity among the people. Talk about unification is coming more from some of the youth. An aspiration to become better acquainted with the traditions, culture, and language which we have in common is serving as the grounds for such talk. There are people who hope to support the Moldavian language by way of unification with Romania.

In addition, personal contacts were until recently not welcomed by either side. Having relatives in Romania and maintaining correspondence with them was considered a negative part of one's biography.

But this was in the past; now, I believe, we must view the integration processes occurring in East Europe differently, as positive processes. For this reason we aspire to develop with Romania the broadest cultural relations. As far as a strengthening of economic relations is concerned, this process will, I believe, move more quickly when the ruble and the lei become freely convertible currencies. The question of the territorial unification of Moldavia and Romania is being posed neither by the Moldavian People's Front nor a single serious political force. It is a question of the sovereignty of the Moldavian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and the possibilities of its realization.

[Makarov] Sovereignty envisages primarily economic independence.

[Luchinskiy] A year ago only eight percent of Moldavia's industrial enterprises were under the jurisdiction of the Moldavian government. This figure is now on the order of 50 percent, but as of January 1991 somewhere on the order of 10 to 12 percent of Moldavian enterprises will be left under the jurisdiction of union ministries.

The center is currently holding back the development of the republic's economy inasmuch as it controls the levers of distribution of components, raw material, and finished products which we need and takes from us the products of our industry and dictates prices.

We understand that initially economic independence will be difficult, but I am sure this is the sole method not only of filling our stores with goods, but also solving many national problems.

Caucasus

Weapons Seized in Attack on Military Detail

PM2504171390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Apr 90 First Edition p 1

[Lieutenant Colonel L. Arshantsev report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Attack on Guard Detail"]

[Excerpt] Yerevan, 26 Apr—Armenian militants are continuing their attempts to seize weapons. During the night of 23-24 April there was an attack on a guard detail in the area of the Uzhanis population center, which is 15 km northeast of Kafan city. As a result 11 automatic rifles, 12 bayonet knives, 11 grenades, and 5,320 cartridges were stolen. [passage omitted].

Situation on Iran-Azerbaijan Border Reported

90US0736A Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 6 Mar 90 p 2

[Report on interview with F. Abasov, senior official of the Azerbaijan KGB, by AZERINFORM correspondent A. Guseynov; date and place not given: "Protect the Border by Common Efforts"]

[Text] **The situation on the Soviet-Iranian border in the border areas of the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] continues to be at the center of attention of the people of the republic. The lack of systematic information on the state of affairs on the border and the incomplete nature of the explanations of the events that are occurring there by the mass media give rise to various kinds of rumors and conjectures, which further complicates the uneasy situation in Azerbaijan. In this connection, an AZERINFORM correspondent asked F. Abasov, a senior official of the KGB of the Azerbaijan SSR, to talk about what kind of situation has developed today on the Soviet-Iran border and what the outlook is for its stabilization.**

[Abasov] "As is known, as a result of massive destruction of border engineering-technical installations which were observed at the end of last year and the beginning of this year, the state border of the Union SSR in the sector along the territory of the Azerbaijan SSR was virtually unprotected. This led to the mutual and uncontrollable movement of Soviet and Iranian citizens, which in the middle of January took on a regular massive character. In individual instances, several thousand persons crossed the border illegally in the course of a day.

At the present time, through the joint efforts of border troops, law enforcement organs, and the local population, a system of measures is being carried out to protect the state border that stretches along the entire sector adjoining the Azerbaijan SSR. Appropriate departments of the republic are examining proposals for regulating contacts between relatives who live on both sides of the border, making them simpler. The implementation of these proposals, together with measures to normalize the situation being undertaken by local organs of authority and border guards personnel, which were set forth, in particular, in the appeal of the Transcaucasus Border District to the inhabitants of the republic, create the conditions for resolving any problems that arise in a calm and business-like situation, and they objectively promote the processes of stabilization.

However, the illegal border crossings on the part of inhabitants of both Iran and the USSR continue to take place. On the average, their number reaches 250 a day. Daily, in Pushkinskiy and Dzhalilabadskiy Rayons alone, more than 150 persons are arrested who try to cross the border illegally in the direction of Iran. Just in the first week of February in these rayons, 631 border trespassers from Iran were arrested. A large number of residents of the IRI [Islamic Republic of Iran] who crossed the border in January-February of this year still continue to remain on the territory of the Azerbaijan SSR. The work on returning them to their permanent places of residence is going slowly. Local organs of authority do not always display the necessary concern and urgency in resolving these questions. The impression is created that someone very badly needs this kind of an unstable situation both on the border and in the adjacent border rayons of the republic.

The continuing gross violations of border procedures, of international legal acts that regulate the rules for crossing the border, and of actions to undermine intergovernmental agreements reached by the USSR and the IRI concerning the procedure for simplified crossing of the border, alarms the local population of the Azerbaijan border area. In their letters and statements, residents of these rayons ask for the establishment of order and the suppression of the activity of persons who are trying to destabilize the situation on the border. The soldier-border guards of the Azerbaijan sector and the employees of the KGB of the republic are making every effort to successfully execute the tasks assigned to them for the normalization of the life and activity of the population in the border rayons.

[Guseynov] Tell me, how justified are rumors about almost daily exchanges of fire on the border and cases of illegal use of weapons against a peaceful population?

[Abasov] I would like to note that during the entire period of actions in the destruction of engineer-technical installations and of massive crossings of the border, the border guards did not use weapons. The leaders of the border troops of the USSR KGB realized well that the use of weapons under such circumstances, even though justified from the standpoint of the law, could lead to serious consequences, numerous victims on the part of residents of the republic and the border guards themselves, and a sharp confrontation between the population of the border rayons and the soldiers of the ZakPO [Transcaucasus Border District]. The further development of events proved the justifiability of these conclusions. The judicious and considered actions of the border guards found an understanding among a large part of the population of the border rayons. Unfortunately, it has to be noted that attempts to disrupt those positive results

whose achievement required the efforts of many people can still be observed on the part of individual persons and groups. Attempts to cross the border illegally with the use of weapons, especially during evening incursions, are continuing to take place. Firings on border guard details are not of an isolated nature. Thus, for the period from 30 January to 16 February, while on duty to guard the border, they came under fire more than 20 times on the state borderline, including on the part of interlopers who were trying to cross it illegally. Here are only a few cases from the situation reports. On 9 February at 0245 a border guard detail consisting of two persons was fired on by unknown persons from the direction of the border. During an inspection of the site of this occurrence, an officer of the border troops was fired on by an automatic weapon. On 14 February at 2040 a border guard detail consisting of three persons was fired upon by tracer bullets. On 16 February several automatic bursts were opened up against a border guard detail that was on duty in one of the sectors of the border.

Despite the danger, the soldier border guards, for the purpose of preventing similar actions, mainly fired only warning shots in the air. But in some cases, in the process of self-defense and actions in strict compliance with the USSR Law "Concerning the State Border," they were compelled also to return fire. As a result of the exchange of fire by the interlopers at the line of the border, one of them was killed and two persons sustained wounds, including one border guard also.

[Guseynov] The Turkish mass media and the newspaper IZVESTIYA reported the arrest of three Turkish correspondents who arrived in Azerbaijan from Iran. I would like to get more detailed information on this score.

[Abasov] On 18 February, information came in that three unknown persons were on board an aircraft on a Baku-Nakhichevan flight who did not have either transit documents or identification papers that were valid on USSR territory. During the process of their interrogation, it was established that they were citizens of Turkey, correspondents of the newspapers MILLIET and GUNAIDIN. The foreigners did not have any kind of documents with them that authorized entry and stay on the territory of the USSR. Up until the circumstances of their arrival in the republic was cleared up, the correspondents were billeted in the Hotel "Moskva." It was established that the foreigners on 26 January illegally crossed the Soviet-Iranian border and during the course of 23 days were on the territory of the Azerbaijan SSR. Criminal proceedings were brought against these citizens of Turkey on the basis of illegal entry into the USSR. A representative of the Turkish Embassy in the USSR was in Baku for this reason. He was given an opportunity to visit the place of preliminary detention of his fellow countrymen, to have personal meetings with them, and to become familiar with materials in the case. In an interview with officials of the MFA [Ministry of Foreign Affairs] and the KGB of the Azerbaijan SSR, the Turkish representative expressed his regret regarding what had occurred, and, on behalf of the government and people of Turkey, he condemned the illegal actions of his fellow citizens who broke the laws of a sovereign state.

The Turkish correspondents explain their actions with a desire to be in a "hot" region and to prepare commentaries concerning the events in the Azerbaijan SSR. But for what reason, one asks, was it necessary to break the laws of a foreign state to satisfy a journalistic interest? As is known, beginning at the end of January, about 50 representatives of the foreign mass media visited the republic. None of them had to break laws or the rules of the country of sojourn. The necessary conditions for work and the satisfaction of journalistic interests were created for all of them.

And about one more thing. The Turkish media reported the detention in Baku of other foreign correspondents whom it would seem the authorities treated more favorably than the Turks, releasing them immediately after their detention. Actually, in the Nakhichevan ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] and the Imishlinskiy Rayon of the republic, six citizens of France and two subjects of Great Britain, who represented the Western mass media, were detained for breaking the law on entry into a border zone and the travel of foreigners on the territory of the USSR. However, it is necessary to keep in mind that violating the rules of travel of foreigners on the territory of the USSR, or the rules of entry into the border area, are administrative violations, and do not entail criminal responsibility. In this connection, after documentation of the illegal actions of the Frenchmen and Englishmen, all of them were evicted from the boundaries of the Azerbaijan SSR, with subsequent submission of information to the USSR MFA for taking appropriate measures. The actions of the Turkish correspondents, specifically crossing the Soviet border without the prescribed passport or the permission of the appropriate authorities, makes up the corpus delicti.

[Guseynov] Do the KGB organs have data about residents of the USSR and Iran utilizing opportunities for freer movement across the border to carry out currency speculation deals and smuggling operations?

[Abasov] Such cases do occur. Some residents of the border regions of the republic and Iran, using the desire to meet with relatives as a cover, take advantage of the existing situation for unimpeded entry onto the territory of the adjoining states and for the conduct of various kinds of illegal operations.

Thus, the massive buying up of products and commodities that are cheaper than in the IRI launched by Iranian residents in the trade network of the border area rayons of the Azerbaijan SSR led in a number of cases to an emptying of store shelves and aroused the dissatisfaction of the local population. The smuggling channel for the export of commodities in short supply in Iran was also used by individual residents of the USSR. Just in January of this year, more than 100 kinds of consumer goods valued at an overall sum of more than 1 million

rubles [R] were confiscated in the sector of the Prishibskiy border detachment during illegal border crossing attempts by violators from among the residents of the republic. This included: 25 television sets, two air conditioners, 50 vacuum cleaners, 32 tape recorders, 16 record players, 28 cameras, 33 electric irons, 138 electric shavers, 2,152 wristwatches, 40 boxes of electric light bulbs, 108 thermos bottles, 12 crystal articles, 15 sets of various service sets, and other objects of clothing, perfumery, and domestic use. Confiscated from four residents of Iran who conducted the illegal import of commodities onto the territory of the USSR were 187 gold articles and consumer items—4,155 watches and 108 tape recorders, and money amounting to more than 7 million rials and more than R40,000 being illegally transported by citizens of the USSR and Iran were confiscated. Despite the adopted measures for strengthening the protection of the state border, smuggling incidents continue to take place. In this connection, I would like to note the following. A reliable shield can be set up against the activity of criminal elements who are getting rich on the illegal transport of commodities and currency only in the event that wide sections of the population join in the fight against the trespassers. There are quite a few such cases of timely assistance by residents of the border rayons of the republic to law enforcement organs. Thus, in February of this year, volunteer civilian policemen and local residents of the Astarinskiy Rayon in the areas of Mechet-Maglya and Palikesh arrested eight border trespassers. A similar incident occurred in the Yardymlinskiy Rayon where, through the joint efforts of the residents of the village of Pirembel and border guards, seven citizens of Iran were arrested who were crossing the border illegally for the purpose of profiteering on our territory.

On the whole, the position of security officers of Azerbaijan on questions of the protection of the state border remains unchanged. We are building a rule-of-law socialist state that is democratic in its content. A lot of things in our state will be changed—the political system, economic relations, and the federal structure. But all of these processes must and will proceed on a legal basis, with absolute adherence to the principle of the supremacy of the law. It is much more important when the question concerns the inviolability of borders and the territorial integrity of the country and the republic. We proceed in our activity from a clear understanding that the inviolability of the borders of the republic and its territorial integrity cannot be achieved at the expense of the destruction of the state borders of the Union SSR and undermining its territorial unity. The security officers of Azerbaijan will resolutely suppress any attempts of any kind that play, incidentally, into the hand of those who are attempting to blame the entire Azeri people for adherence to nationalism. The successful resolution of assigned tasks for the protection of the state borders of the USSR is possible only given the effective cooperation of the KGB of the Azerbaijan SSR and subunits of the Transcaucasus Border District, and, what is most important of all, on the basis of support on the part of residents of the republic for the efforts we are making to normalize the situation.

Soldier Wounded in Attack on Azerbaijani Town

NC2504200090 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] The situation in the Transcaucasus remains alarming. The Azerbaijani town of Nyuvadi in Armenia's Megrinskiy Rayon was attacked on 24 April. The attackers, who were armed with automatic weapons, exchanged fire with the Internal Affairs Ministry troops protecting the town. The attack by the bandits was repulsed. [passage indistinct] A search is under way for the perpetrators of the bandit attack. Colonel General Yuriy Shatalin, commander of the Internal Troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, has traveled to the region where the incident took place.

Speaking to AZERINFORM correspondent Askerov, Colonel Popov, head of the Operations Group of the Internal Troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, noted that Armenian bandits also directed automatic weapons fire against the towns of Ashagi Buzgov and Yukari Buzgov in Babeskiy Rayon on the same day. A soldier was seriously wounded during the exchange of fire and is being treated at the Nakhichevan Oblast hospital. Col. Popov said that under the circumstances a state of emergency should be declared throughout Megrinskiy Rayon because the main Armenian bandit groups are based in that rayon.

The local militia and committee for state security organs are helping the Internal Affairs Ministry troops normalize the situation.

Ordzhonikidze Rayon Name Changed to Surakhanskiy

LD2504103590 Baku KOMMUNIST in Azeri 19 Apr 90 p1

[Text] The decree of the Presidium of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet on restoring the name of the Surakhanskiy Rayon [Azeri: Surakhany] of the city of Baku:

Taking into consideration numerous requests of workers and public organizations and the petitioning of the executive committee of the Baku city Soviet of People's Deputies on restoring the previous name—the name of the Surakhanskiy Rayon of Baku, the Presidium of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet decrees:

Ordzhonikidze Rayon of the city of Baku be renamed Surakhanskiy Rayon.

[Signed] E. Kafarova, chairman of the Presidium of the AzSSR Supreme Soviet.
R. Kaziyeva, secretary of the Presidium of the AzSSR Supreme Soviet.
City of Baku, 18 April 1990.

Azerbaijan Interior Minister Appointed

LD250410!990 Baku KOMMUNIST in Azeri 19 Apr 90 p 1

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] The Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium has decreed to appoint comrade Magomed Nabi ogly Asadov as minister of internal affairs of the Azerbaijan SSR. [passage omitted]

M.N. Asadov was born in 1941. He is a member of the CPSU and an economist by profession. [passage omitted] He was elected first secretary of Agdash Rayon Party Committee in 1988, and in 1989 he was elected first secretary of Guba Rayon Party Committee. [passage omitted] He is a candidate member of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan Central Committee. [passage omitted]

Georgia Party Calls for Aid to Lithuania

LD2604083490 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0700 GMT 26 Apr 90

[Text] Sajudis Information Agency reports: On 25 April the Georgian Social Democratic Party in Tbilisi appealed to the republic's Council of Ministers categorically demanding refusal to take part in Lithuania's economic blockade and to continue mutual trade. In the same appeal Georgia's people are asked to render material aid to the state of Lithuania.

More on Georgian Support

LD2604090190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0700 GMT 26 Apr 90

[Text] Sajudis Information Agency reports:

Tbilisi: On 24 April a meeting was held at the National Front building. Its main slogans were: Independent Georgia must be democratic; Stop Lithuania's economic blockade. The meeting passed a resolution. Its main demands are as follows: 1. The Georgian Supreme Soviet must immediately convene an extraordinary session and state that Georgia has absolutely no claims to the republic of Lithuania. 2. Repeal laws providing for criminal responsibility for refusal to serve in the Soviet Army.

If these demands are not complied with, the participants in the meeting will start permanent protest actions. A fund of aid to Lithuania has been opened at the Commerical Bank.

Georgian Church Head Appeals to Gorbachev

LD2404183490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 24 Apr 90

[Text] Ilya II, the Patriarch Catholicos of All Georgia, has sent a message to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. The head of the Georgian Orthodox Church calls on the USSR president to repeal the death penalty. The message, published in the republican newspapers, says, among other things: May your sacrificial and selfless service in the lofty office of president be marked by the abolition of the death penalty in our state. Ilya II called for mercy to be shown those young prisoners who have acknowledged their guilt in full and are prepared to mend their ways.

Central Asia

Radiation Sources Discovered in Tashkent, Samarkand

LD2504125490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 25 Apr 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] Here is news from Tashkent Oblast. Specialists regard the discovery as a major emergency. Not far from the substation of the Almalyk mining and metallurgical combine containers have been discovered. The contents are a source of radiation.

In Samarkand sources of radioactive emanation have been discoverd on the premises of an oncological clinic and near a home for the elderly. Why are radioactive dumps multiplying? Evidently there is no tough control over the owners of dangerous waste.

Tajik Supreme Soviet Chairman Notes Tasks

LD2404204990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 24 Apr 90

[Report by correspondent Muzafar Majidov in Dushanbe]

[Text] The new complement of people's deputies of the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] elected for the first time on a multicandidate basis, gathered for their first session on 12 April. Today the almost two-week long marathon ended. A chairman of the republics' Supreme Soviet has been elected as well as his deputies. In accordance with the constitution of the Tajik SSR, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet has been formed. A new government has been formed. A decision has been adopted on the election of the chairman of the Supreme court as well as many other documents and decisions. During the final break in the session today I interviewed Kakhar Makhkamovich Makhkamov, chairman of the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet.

[Begin recording] [Makhkamov] We have approved the new government of which almost one-third has been changed. One-third of the ministers are new people, as a rule young and energetic people. Issues of an economic and legislative nature are being raised very energetically at the session. Issues which are specific to our republic are being raised.

[Majidov] You worked for many years as the chairman of Gosplan; then you headed the council of ministers; then you were first secretary of the Central Committee;

and now you are chairman of the Supreme Soviet and, at the same time, first secretary of the Communist Party of Tajikistan Central Committee. So, how do you see your work in the post of chairman of the Supreme Soviet?

[Makhkamov] As I see it, my work as chairman of the Supreme Soviet is first of all to adopt the necessary, correct and essential laws and to approach the resolution of issues very carefully and with great knowledge of the matter in hand. I believe that not just legislation, but also the implementation of laws must be one of the important requirements of the Supreme Soviet in the future. [end recording]

Dushanbe Curfew Extended

LD2504090990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1633 GMT 24 Apr 90

[Text] Dushanbe, 24 Apr (TAJIKTA-TASS)—The first session of the newly elected parliament of this Soviet Central Asian republic finished today, here in the capital of Tajikistan, with the adoption of a major series of draft laws. Having heard information from a number of officials, the Supreme Soviet decided to extend the curfew and the state of emergency which has been functioning on the territory of Dushanbe since 12 February.

As is well known, the republic's Supreme Soviet only took emergency measures after destabilizing forces had attempted to seize power. As a result of programs and other violent actions by an extremist-minded section of the youth, people died and material damage amounting to almost R60 million was done.

The deputies submitted amendments to a number of articles in the constitution (basic law) of Tajikistan on issues of the political system and confirmed laws on the status of people's Deputies of the republic and also on responsibility for the destabilization of the sociopolitical situation in Tajikistan.

In the opinion of People's Deputy (Nurullo Khuvaydullayev), the chairman of the commission on issues of legislation and the rights and appeals of citizens, the new parliamentary body has shown its ability to act and its professionalism from the first days of its work.

"I am satisfied with the results of the first session," he noted. "Within a few days we have formed a new ministerial cabinet, the chairman of which has come forward with a constructive governmental program to extricate the republic from socioeconomic crisis."

Supreme Soviet Makes Appointments

LD2404173890

[Editorial Report] Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TAJIKISTANA in Russian on 14 April publishes on page one a report on Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet decisions on the following appointments:

Izatullo Khayeyevich Khayeyev is appointed chairman of the Tajik SSR Council of Ministers;

Kadriddin Aslonovich Aslonov is appointed first deputy chairman of the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet; and

Akbarsho Iskandarovich Iskandarov and Yevgeniy Ilich Turgunov are appointed deputy chairmen of the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet.